

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXVII, 2.

WHOLE No. 106.

I.—ANCIENT SINOPE.

FIRST PART.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

No monograph on Sinope has been written since 1855. In that year, when interest in the Black Sea towns had been for some time stimulated by the Crimean war, and Sinope had been forced into temporary prominence by a naval battle near the town between the Turks and Russians, appeared W. T. Streuber's historical sketch (*Sinope, ein Historisch-Antiquarischer Umriss*, Basel, 1855). It was marred by many mistakes, and the author could not avail himself of the numerous inscriptions and coins which have since thrown so much light upon the city's annals. Many of the best histories of Greece and of the Greek colonies, moreover, have been written during the half-century that has elapsed since that time. In 1902, while I was studying as fellow at the American School in Athens, Professor Edward Capps suggested that I use the opportunity to make a thorough investigation of all material connected with ancient Sinope and, if practicable, embody the results in a connected account. Kindly letters from Professor Edward Meyer of Berlin and Professor George Busolt of Göttingen encouraged me to make the attempt. After much preliminary study I went in June, 1903, to live in the town itself, made journeys in different directions through the immediate locality and sought to quicken and unify my investigations into a living, historic portrayal. How far I have succeeded the reader must judge for himself.

The indebtednesses of the author are of course many and varied, as the notes and references indicate. In addition to the geographical works cited on page 126, mention should be made of the brief *Sinopicarum Quaestionum Specimen* by M. Sengebusch (Berlin, 1846), of the article by Six on coins of Sinope in the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1885, of the general histories, and especially of Eduard Meyer, *Geschichte des Königreichs Pontos*, and Reinach-Götz, *Mithradates Eupator*. The ancient sources and other modern works will be found cited throughout the paper.

CHAPTER I.

THE SITE.

The configuration of the country round Sinope, its geographic position, its products, the security of its double harbor, and the impregnability of its rocky promontory, have conspired to write its name in the annals of war, of commerce, of popular and governmental independence and development, and of biography, literature, and art.

The northern coast of Asia Minor is like a central mounting billow with a trough on each side. The billow and the two troughs taken together, form the entire southern shore of the Pontus, and the outline is symmetrical, so that the crest of the wave is the middle point of the shore. The crest, however, is somewhat flattened, and just at its eastern edge, before it begins to fall away, it throws out a bold promontory.¹ From the eastern corner of this main promontory² juts out in a north-easterly direction the smaller peninsula on whose low landward neck Sinope is built.³

The peninsula itself is a promontory,⁴ about 600 feet in height, with precipitous sides and a broad level table-land at the top. Its outline somewhat resembles that of a boar's head with the

¹ Called Syrias in Marcian, *Epitome Peripli Maris Interni*. 9; but Lepte in Arrian, *Peripl.* 21; and Syrias Acrulepte in the anonymous *Periplus Ponti Euxini* 20. Cf. Müller, *Geographi Graeci Minores* I, pp. 571, 387, 406. The modern Turkish name is Indjé-burun.

² *Geographi Minores*, pl. XVIII.

³ Cf. Strabo XII 545 ἰδρυται γὰρ ἐπὶ αὐχένι Χερρονήσου; cf. Polybius IV 56, οἰκεῖται δ' ἐπὶ τινος Χερρονήσου προτεινούσης εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, ἥς τὸν μὲν αὐχένα τὸν συνάπτοντα πρὸς τὴν Ἀσίαν, ὅς ἐστιν οὐ πλείον δυοῖν σταδίων, ἢ πόλις ἐπικειμένη διακλεῖει κυρίως. τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν τῆς Χερρονήσου πρόκειται μὲν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος, ἐστὶ δ' ἐπίπεδον καὶ πανευέροδον ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν, κύκλῳ δ' ἐκ θαλάττης ἀπότομον καὶ δυσπροσέρμiston καὶ παντελῶς ὀλίγας ἔχον προσβάσεις; Herod. IV 12; Eust. *Commentarii* 248, 773, 970; Plut. *Luc.* 23.

⁴ Several travellers and geographers mention this promontory, which to-day is called Boz-tepé (gray hill), a name which is also applied to the Greek quarter of Sinope, just outside the walls of the Turkish village, itself called Sinub or Sinob or Sinab; and also to the eastern cape where the modern lighthouse stands: cf. Meletios, *Geographie* p. 482; Ritter, *Kleinasien* I, pp. 784, 794; Hommaire de Hell, *Voyage en Turquie et en Perse*. II, p. 344 ff; Rottiers, *Itineraire de Tiflis à Constantinople*, p. 275; Taitbout de Marigny,

highest point at the snout in the extreme east. It is about two miles in length and one mile in width at the widest part. It appears to have been of volcanic formation and, judging by the cretaceous over the volcanic deposits, to have been at one time below the level of the sea and afterwards heaved up slowly into its present position. The rock is evidently of volcanic nature and is of the same quality with those in eastern Anatolia. In the north central part of the nearly level plateau there still exists a lake which is at present very shallow, but which probably is an old crater.¹ Such geologic formation, after decomposition by the weather, has considerable fertility.² At the time of my visit cows, horses, and goats were pasturing upon the short grass. There were also abundant wild flowers and shrubbery, including juniper and laurel. Under the conditions of an ancient siege the produce of the entire area might support a considerable army even when all other supplies were cut off. Water also would be abundant. A short distance down the slope by which the promontory descends to the town,³ there is a cave in which there is an underground stream of cool, drinkable water.⁴ Both the inflow and the outflow are secure from pollution. An underground passage-way leads from the cave down to the town. Its date is later than the Greek or Roman period, but the idea of reaching the hidden water in this protected way might have suggested itself at any time. There are springs also on the plateau itself,⁵ one of which in the

Pilote de la Mer Noire et de la Mer d'Azov, p. 159; Tozer, Turkish Armenia and Eastern Asia Minor, p. 7. A view of Sinope and Boz-tepé from the southeast is given in Tournefort, Relation d'un Voyage du Levant II, lettre 17, p. 203; Reclus, Nouvelle Géographie Universelle IX, p. 566 (with map and photograph of Sinope); Jaubert, Voyage en Arménie et en Perse, p. 394; cf. also page 128, note 4 of this paper and Mannert, Géographie 6, 3, 15.

¹ This is the opinion of Brauns, who wrote a good article on the geology of the peninsula of Sinope, entitled Beobachtungen in Sinope, in the Zeitschrift für allgemeine Erdkunde N. F. II (1857), p. 28 ff. He gives a good geological map.

² Cf. Strabo XII 545, ἀνωθεν μέντοι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως εὐγεῶν ἐστὶ τὸ ἑδαφος καὶ ἀγροκηπίους κεκόσμηται πυκνοῖς, πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον τὰ προάστεια.

³ Cf. Polybius IV 56.

⁴ The cave to-day is called 'Byzana' by the Greeks, because the water seems to flow from breasts. A religious ceremony is performed there in the spring-time. Perhaps Hamilton, Researches in Asia Minor, p. 312, refers to this cave.

⁵ The modern town gets its water from the peninsula; cf. Hamilton, op. cit. p. 312.

southeasterly portion sends its stream out horizontally from a hillock into a sarcophagus of Roman date bearing a Greek inscription.¹

While the general outline of the promontory may be compared to a boar's head, its steep bristling sides have caused it to be likened to a petrified hedgehog.² The action of the sea against rocks of varying hardness, such as trachyte, black volcanic breccia, red chalky scaglia, also varying greatly in density, shelly limestone, and sandstone,³ has left a mass of sharp projections around the coast. Down at the water-line, and below the surface, the sea has hollowed out caves and water-filled holes, the "Choenicides" of Strabo.⁴ Upon such a shore⁵ it was almost impossible to effect a landing, and still more difficult to reach the easily defended plateau above.

Descending in a southwesterly direction along the axis of the promontory, we cross through the low neck, narrowed by the double harbor to about a quarter of a mile⁶ in width and ascend to the mainland, a region of extraordinary beauty and fertility. Southward the foreground shows scattered areas of wheat, barley, corn, rice, and other grain interspersed with vineyards and orchards of fruit-trees of the widest variety. There are apples, pears, figs, peaches, plums, medlars, apricots and cherries. The last are natives of this southern shore and are believed to have been carried from this place of origin to Italy and thence to other lands. Cerasus, a colony of Sinope on this same shore,⁷ got its name from the abundance of its cherry-trees.⁸ The olive tree

¹ Cf. Am. J. Arch. IX (1905) p. 315, no. 44.

² Cf. Reinach-Götz, Mithradates Eupator p. 352 and the epithet *ἐχινώδης* applied to the rock in Strabo XII 545. Cf. also Sengebusch, op. cit. p. 14.

³ Cf. the article of Brauns, p. 28 ff. and Hamilton, op. cit. p. 312 for the geology of the promontory of Sinope.

⁴ Cf. Strabo XII 545. καὶ κύκλῳ δ' ἡ Χερρόνησος προβέβληται ῥαχιδεῖς ἀκτὰς ἐχούσας καὶ κοιλάδας τινὰς ὥσανεὶ βόθρους πετρίνους οὓς καλοῦσι χοινικίδας. πληροῦνται δὲ οὗτοι μετεωρισθείσης τῆς θαλάττης, ὥς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εὐπρόσιτον τὸ χωρίον καὶ διὰ τὸ πᾶσαν τὴν τῆς πέτρας ἐπιφάνειαν ἐχινώδη καὶ ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι γυμνῷ ποδί. For the Choenicides, cf. Hamilton, op. cit. p. 310 and Ritter, Kleinasien I, p. 776.

⁵ Orph. Argonautika 757, τρηχύν τ' ἀγκῶνα Σινώπης; Polyb. IV 56, 5 and note 4 on this page.

⁶ Cf. Polyb. ibid., οὐ πλεον δυοῖν σταδίων.

⁷ Xen. Anab. V 3, 2.

⁸ Athen. II 51 a; Plin. N. H. XV 30; Ammianus XXII 8, 16; Steph. s. Κέρασος Eust. II. II 853; Hehn, Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere,⁸ pp. 327, 345 f.

was anciently more abundant than now,¹ and Sinope is its westward limit on the Pontus.² I saw but few groves,³ whereas Strabo seems to think of the whole region as covered with them. Further away in the background and to the eastward and westward are noble forests of oak, pine, walnut, chestnut, maple, elm, beech, box, cypress, and other trees, with an undergrowth of shrubs. There are also many of the latter out in the open. In the distance is the purple, waving outline of the mountain rampart, which separated the old Greek civilization of the coast from the barbarian people of the interior,⁴ and, in fact, performs a similar function to-day. The mountainous district, however, must not be thought of as rugged and unfertile; for, on the contrary, it is like the maritime plain, richly productive, the mountain slopes and valleys especially possessing a high degree of fertility.

The exact area of the territory of the state of Sinope⁵ cannot now be determined. It was much less than that of the province of Paphlagonia to which it belonged,⁶ whether the eastern limit of that province be drawn at the Thermodon, the Iris, or the town of Amisus;⁷ for Strabo indicates a separation between the district

¹ Cf. Strabo XII 546, ἅπαντα δὲ καὶ ἐλαιόφυττός ἐστιν ἢ μικρὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς θαλάττης γεωργουμένη and 73, τὰ δὲ τῆς Σινώπης προάστεια καὶ τῆς Ἀμισοῦ καὶ τῆς Φαναροίας τὸ πλεον ἐλαιόφυτά ἐστι; Cf. Eust. II. II 853.

² Xen. Anab. VI 4, 6, and Jaubert op. cit. p. 395 "Plus près de Constantinople l'humidité du sol et l'inconstance des vents empêchent que cet arbre délicat ne prospère". Perhaps the southwestern wind that blew from Phrygia, called βερεκυντίας was the cause of the growth of the olives at Sinope; cf. Aristotle 973 a, 24; frag. 238, 1521 b, 17.

³ On Boz-tepe just outside the Greek quarter as you go toward the Quarantine Station, Nesi Kieuï, there is to-day a grove of olives, and there are some on the mainland, but the tree is not in favor among the present inhabitants.

⁴ Cf. Cic. de Rep. 2, 4.

⁵ The name of the city itself is Σινώπη. L. and S. give a short ι, but cf. Herodian, περὶ Ὀρθογραφίας ed. Lentz II 580, 26. Xenophon says also ἡ Σινωπέων πόλις. The name of the Sinopean district is in Xen. (Anab. V 6, 11) ἡ Σινωπέων χώρα, in Strabo (XII 546, 561 and elsewhere) ἡ Σινωπιτις or Σινωπῖς. Steph. Byz. gives also Σινωπῖς and Σινωπικόν. The male inhabitant is Σινωπέυς, Herodian, ed. Lentz II 891, 27, or Σινωπίτης (cf. Dion. Orb. Descr. 255 and Herodian, ed. Lentz I 77; II 869, 37), in Latin Sinopensis or Sinopeus; the female inhabitant Σινωπις (cf. Herodian II 891, 1). The adjective is Σινωπικός (Steph. Byz.). Σινωπαῖος occurs in C. I. G. 7074.

⁶ Xen. Anab. VI 1, 15. Σινωπεῖς δὲ οἰκοῦσι μὲν ἐν τῇ Παφλαγονικῇ. So also Strabo XII 544 f., Diodorus XIV 31, Pliny N. H. VI 2 and Arrian, Periplus 20, 21.

⁷ Herodotus I 72 and Strabo XII 1, 1; 3, 9, 25 seem to make the Halys the eastern boundary, but Scylax and Marcian, the river Evarchus. In Xeno-

of Amisus and the district of Sinope at the river Halys,¹ still further to the west. On the other hand it is equally clear that Sinope did not extend its power westward to the Bithynian border.² Nature erected a southern limit in the Olgassys mountains.³ Perhaps we should not be far from the truth if we bounded the ancient Sinopean district by the Pontus on the north, the Halys on the east, the Olgassys mountains on the south, and an indefinite line on the west drawn at about the 32nd parallel.⁴

Returning to the town on the neck of the promontory we find upon the site of the ancient city an inner walled enclosure with a Turkish castle and prison, probably the site of the Sinopean acropolis, and outside the wall northeastward, toward the promontory, the Greek and Christian quarter.⁵ Unhappily there are few certain data for reconstructing the ancient city. Looking down from the height above I tried in vain to make a mental plan which would include the stoas, gymnasium, and market-place,⁶ the Palace of Mithradates,⁷ and the Temple of Serapis. There are no ruins or even any mounded outlines for points of departure. However, we have the two walls across the isthmus which have been built and razed and rebuilt in the same positions and out of the most heterogeneous materials arranged in the most disorderly manner. There are foundation stones from buildings; columns of Roman date whose unfluted sides indicate their previous position in stoas;⁸ pieces of sculpture scattered at random, including a lion built into the top of the wall, in one case, while a similar one lies upon the ground;⁹ and pieces of architraves and of cor-

phon's time the Thermodon was the boundary. Plin. VI 2 makes Amisus a city in Paphlagonia. Ptolemy makes a mistake when he (V 4 and VIII 17, 26) includes Sinope in Galatia. It belonged later to the Roman province of Bithynia and Pontus, but never to Galatia (cf. on this Cumont, *Revue des Études Grecques* XVI (1903), pp. 25-27.

¹ Cf. Strabo, XII 546, 560; Arrian *Peripl.* 22; Anonym. *Peripl.* 25.

² Strabo, XII 546.

³ Strabo, XII 561, 562.

⁴ Armene, fifty stadia to the west, was part of Sinope: cf. *Ἀρμένην τῆς Σινώπης*, Xen. *Anab.* VI 1, 15; Strabo, XII 545. But the district of Sinope certainly extended still further west.

⁵ Cf. the geographers and travellers quoted above.

⁶ Cf. Strabo XII 546 αὐτῇ δ' ἡ πόλις τετείχισται καλῶς, καὶ γυμνασίῳ δὲ καὶ ἀγορῇ καὶ στοαῖς κεκόσμηται λαμπρῶς.

⁷ What the inhabitants call "the Palace of Mithradates", a large structure in Boz-tepe with three vaulted chambers and a Byzantine chapel in its midst, is of later date than Mithradates. Hamilton, *op. cit.* p. 312 refers to it.

⁸ Perhaps they come from the stoas mentioned by Strabo.

⁹ Cf. Hommaire de Hell, *op. cit.* p. 346; Hamilton, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

nices. Many other pieces of carving have been carried away by individuals or have found their way into museums, especially that at Constantinople. In the wall nearest the mainland, but on the inside, are arches indicating the remains of a Roman aqueduct.¹ This part of this wall is better built than the rest and probably goes back to Roman date, whereas the greater portion of it, like the other walls, was built by the Genoese and later by Turks.

The main factor in the making of Sinope, as in the making of Cyzicus, has been its double harbor² commanding the eastward and westward sea and in both ancient and modern times the best on the southern shore of the Pontus. In ancient times the southerly harbor was improved and ruins exist of a mole³ which seems to be as old as Mithradates the Great. No river flows into either harbor to silt it up, but the northerly harbor has been shallowed by sand deposits and is no longer usable by vessels of modern draft. The deeper water and the lighter draft vessels of the ancient day, however, made it accessible for commercial purposes.⁴ It may be that even in the time of Pericles and later in the days of Mithradates the northerly harbor was deep enough for their full-sized craft.

CHAPTER II.

IMPORTANCE OF THE SITE.

It may well be believed that, however unimportant, through distance and misrule, Sinope may have come to be in the eyes of our western world, the ancient Greeks would hold in high esteem a city-state so fertile, so fortified, and so far-reaching in its natural command of the land and of the sea. An examination

¹ Cf. Honnaire de Hell, op. cit. p. 346; Hamilton, op. cit. p. 309; Ritter, op. cit. p. 789-790; cf. also Pliny Ep., X 91.

² Cf. Strabo XII 545, ἐκατέρωθεν δὲ τοῦ ἰσθμοῦ λιμένες.

³ Taitbout de Marigny, op. cit. p. 159; Hamilton, op. cit. p. 310.

⁴ In his epitome of the journey of Menippus, Marcian of Heraclea 9 speaks of an island lying off Sinope, *κεῖται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκρῶν νησίον, ὃ καλεῖται Σκόπελος*. Ἐχει δὲ διέκπλουν τοῖς ἐλάττοσι πλοίοις, τὰ δὲ μείζονα περιπλεῖν δεῖ καὶ οὕτω καταίρειν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. Εἰσὶ δὲ τοῖς περιπλέονσι τὴν νῆσον πλείους ἄλλοι στάδιοι μ' (Müller, Geog. Gr. Min. I, p. 571). An anonymous Byzantine writer (Müller, p. 407) of the fifth century uses the same words, doubtless derived from the same source, which is of about the time of Augustus. But the only island existing to-day at Sinope is a small low-lying rock off the promontory, mentioned by Taitbout de Marigny, op. cit. p. 159, the détour of which could not possibly

of their literature shows that such was the actual fact. Strabo¹ and Diodorus² thought it the most notable and important of all cities on the southern shore of the Pontus. Mela³ joins it with Amisus as one of the two most famous cities of the whole region. Valerius Flaccus⁴ calls it "great and wealthy", Eutropius⁵ "most noble" and Stephanus of Byzantium⁶ and Eustathius⁷ "most eminent". Among later writers, Ammianus⁸ and Phrantzes⁹ class it among important cities of antiquity.

More significant testimonies, however, are watermarked rather than expressed. Plautus' Curculio (v. 443) sneers at the *leno* that he, all by himself, within the last twenty days has conquered half of all the nations, including Persians, Paphlagonians, Sinopeans, Arabs, Carians, Cretans, etc. But while his whole long list contains the names of so many nationalities the only city important enough to be included in the sneer is Sinope.

increase the necessary sailing distance by more than a small fraction of 40 stadia. Moreover, the water between this island and the mainland is very deep, and even the largest modern steamer sails boldly through the passage. The solution of the difficulty seems to lie in the word *νησίον*. A peninsula was a land island, (*χερσόνησος*, Halb-insel). The village at the Quarantine station on the promontory to-day is called Nesi Kieu (the island village). The modern Greeks as a matter of fact at present speak of the whole promontory as *νησί*. The confusion between the little island and the promontory has extended to modern writers. Sengebusch, op. cit. p. 15 says, "ante hunc portum insula quaedam sita erat, *Σκόπελος* vocata. Naviculis per fretum navigare licebat, quod inter illam est et terram continentem, XL vel L stadiorum iter; magnae naves onerariae Scopelum circumnavigabant per altum mare, LXXX vel LXXXX stadium iter". And even Ritter (Kleinasien, p. 794), following the authority of a Black Sea pilot (Taitbout de Marigny), connects the little island with the Scopelus of Marcian, while in an earlier passage (p. 776) he has made the same word of the same passage refer to the promontory. The increased sailing distance of vessels going round the promontory corresponds quite exactly to the 40 stadia of the writer whom Marcian epitomizes. (Sengebusch wrongly gives 80 or 90 stadia.) And *δέκπλου* evidently refers not to sailing between the little island and the mainland, but simply to the passage from the town out through the northerly harbor into the open sea. The true interpretation then, of the original writer whom Marcian epitomizes, is that vessels of light draft could sail directly out from or directly into the northerly harbor, while those drawing more water must circumnavigate the promontory for an extra distance of 40 stadia in order to reach the other harbor.

¹ Cf. XII 545, ἀξιολογώτατη τῶν ταύτη πόλεων.

² XIV 31 μέγιστον εἶχεν ἀξίωμα τῶν περὶ τοὺς τόπους.

³ I 19.

⁴ V 109.

⁵ VI 8.

⁶ Cf. s. v. Σινώπη.

⁷ Eust. Commentarii 773.

⁸ XXII 8, 16.

⁹ I 32; IV 19.

Sinope was also the name of a prominent courtesan at Athens who either took or received the name Sinope in the same fashion as other harlots were called Megara and Cyrene.¹ Nor was she a mere individual, or subordinate character, but rather the mistress of an establishment of some size, the inmates of which included the celebrated Pythionike.² The woman also figured in Athenian comedies,³ and even caused a verbal coinage, *σινωπίζειν*,⁴ which meant "to be debauched or dissolute". She seems moreover to have been a marked figure in Athenian life for a long enough period to be called at last Abydos, *διὰ τὸ γράψ εἶναι*.⁵

Sinope, however, has much more reputable associations than these. The scholiast, on the *Odyssey* XII 257, mentions one Sinopos as a companion of Odysseus who was engulfed by the whirlpool at Scylla and Charybdis.⁶ One of the seven editions of Homer was the Sinopic.⁷ One of the cities whose constitution Aristotle thought worthy of a treatise was Sinope.⁸ One of the deliberative orations ascribed, however inaccurately, to Isocrates was the *Σινωπικός*.⁹ The earliest Greek writers¹⁰ celebrated the mythology of this town.

We may note in passing that Sinope was considered to be the headquarters of the Cimmerians,¹¹ that its fortifications were

¹ Sinope was a harlot also in Aegina and Corinth, cf. Athenaeus XIII 595 a; Suidas, s. *Ἐραῖραι Κορίνθιαι*; Schol. Arist. Plut. 149; Dem. XXII 610; LIX 1385; Athenaeus XIII 594 a. For fact that harlots as slaves were often named after their birth-place, cf. Bechtel, *Die Attischen Frauennamen*, p. 57 f. (Bechtel omits the names of the harlots Sinope and Cyrene. For Cyrene cf. Arist. Thesm. 98; Frogs 1328.

² Cf. Athenaeus XIII 595 a; Droysen, *Hellenismus*, I 2, p. 239.

³ Cf. Athenaeus VIII 339 a; XIII 558 b, 567 f, 586 a.

⁴ Cf. Apostol. XV 50 in Leutsch-Schneidewin, *Paroemiographi Graeci*, II, p. 641; and Suidas, Photius, Hesychius, s. v. *σινωπίζειν*.

⁵ Cf. Athenaeus XIII 558 b, 586 a; cf. Photius, Suidas, Harpocration s. v. *Σινώπη*.

⁶ Cf. Eustathius 1721, 9; Wilamowitz, *Phil. Unters* VII 167; Maass, (*Hermes*, XXIII 618) identifies him, rather improbably with Sinon who played an important part in the taking of Troy in the *Little Iliad*. Cf. Virgil *Aeneid* II, 29 and also Paus. X 27, 3.

⁷ Schol. Il. I 298, 423, 435; II 258; V 461. Wolf's *Prolegomena*, p. 175; Pauly, *Realencyclop.* s. v. *Homerus*; Ludwig, *Aristarchs Hom Text-kritik*, I, p. 4.

⁸ Schol. Ap. Rhod. II 948; Arist. fr. 540, 1567 b23. ⁹ Cf. Anonym. Vit. Isoc.

¹⁰ Eumelus of Corinth and Hecataeus of Miletus. Cf. Schol. Ap. Rhod. II 946; Eudocia s. v. *Σινώπη* and Arist. l. c.

¹¹ Her. IV 12; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* I, p. 453.

renowned,¹ and that its fleet dominated the Pontus and even sailed away for contests in other seas.²

As a last testimony to the consequence of Sinope, and in order to put it in immediate connection with our discussion of the commerce of the port in the next chapter, we here note that Sinope was a frequent point from which to reckon distances and for elucidating geographical relations.³ Although Pteria is not near Sinope, as was formerly supposed, but was considerably south of it, as Ramsay shows,⁴ it was nevertheless spoken of as *κατὰ Σινώπην*,⁵ or as we might say, on the same parallel with Sinope. And again, although the narrowest part of Asia Minor was on the line from the gulf of Issus to Amisus, the superior importance of Sinope led Strabo to draw his line of shortest transit to that city and not to Amisus.⁶ It was from Sinope that Carusa was distant 150 stadia,⁷ Amisus 900 stadia,⁸ Phasis 2 or 3 days' journey⁹ and, in the westerly direction, Armene 40 stadia,¹⁰ Cape Carambis 700 stadia,¹¹ further away Cyturus 1312 stadia,¹² Amastris 1450 stadia,¹³ Heraclea 2000 stadia¹⁴ and the Hieron of Jupiter Urius at the Thracian Bosphorus, 3500 stadia.¹⁵ Many places are said to be situated "near Sinope", though some of them as a matter of fact are not very near it. Abonutichos¹⁶ is ἄγχι Σινώπης. The Halys¹⁷ and Thermodon¹⁸ are ποταμοὶ περὶ Σινώπην. Heraclea¹⁹ was a πόλις περὶ Σινώπην. Corocondame²⁰ was πλησίον Σινώπης. Strabo calls the

¹ Priscianus 751.

² Strabo XII 545.

³ Sinope was the Greenwich of antiquity, cf. Bury, *History of Greece*, p. 236.

⁴ Ramsay, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 33, identifies Pteria with Boghaz-kieui. Cf. also Perrot et Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, IV 598 ff, Steph. Byz. Πτερία, πόλις Σινώπης.

⁵ Her. I 76, ἡ δὲ Πτερὶή ἐστὶ τῆς χώρας ταύτης τὸ ἰσχυρότατον κατὰ Σινώπην πᾶσιν τῶν ἐν Εὐξείνῳ Πόντῳ μάλιστα καὶ κειμένη. There is no reason for concluding from this passage that Herodotus visited Sinope, as Matzat, *Hermes* VI 416, does. Herodotus certainly visited Phasis and probably got his information from Sinopean merchants there.

⁶ Strabo XVI 677.

⁷ Cf. Arrian *Peripl. Pont. Eux.* 21.

⁸ Cf. Strabo XII 547; according to Pliny N. H. VI 2, 1040 stadia (130 miles).

⁹ Cf. Strabo XI 498.

¹⁰ Cf. Arrian *Peripl.* 21; Anonym. *Peripl.* 21; Marcian *Epitome Periplus Menippe* 9.

¹¹ Marcian op. cit. 9; Strabo XII 546; Schol. Ap. Rhod. II 945.

¹² Pliny N. H. VI 2 says 164 miles.

¹³ Marcian, op. cit. 9.

¹⁴ Strabo XII 546; Marcian op. cit. 9 gives 2040.

¹⁵ Strabo *ibid.*; Marcian *ibid.*, gives 3570.

¹⁶ Lucian *Alexander* 11.

¹⁷ Schol. Apoll. Rh. 2, 366.

¹⁸ Tzetz. *Lyc.* 647.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* 695.

²⁰ Steph. s. v.

southern shore of the Pontus τὴν Σινώπης παραλίαν¹ and Eratosthenes speaks of Παφλαγονίας καὶ τῶν περὶ Σινώπην.² Livy³ locates Gordium as a point equally distant from the Hellespont, the Cilician shore, and the sea at Sinope. Cicero's oratory⁴ finds the remotest enemies of Rome with whom Verres had communicated at the Spanish Dianium on the west and at Sinope on the east. Isocrates⁵ marks the limits of the Greek population in Asia Minor by Cnidus and Cilicia in the west and Sinope in the east. Pliny⁶ puts it in the fifth segment of the world, while Avienus⁷ in the fifth century A. D. places it near the confines of the earth.

CHAPTER III.

THE COMMERCE OF SINOPE.

The ship's prow often found upon the obverse of coins of Sinope is an indication of its commercial instinct.⁸ In fact the distances given at the close of the last chapter are in the main commercial, and lead us on to discuss its trade relations which were of the highest importance. To the list of places already mentioned we must add the islands of the Aegean, including Rhodes⁹ and Delos, to which votive offerings were shipped,¹⁰ Attica, Greece in general,¹¹ and even Egypt.¹² Its coastwise trade covered

¹ Strabo I 46; II 74.

² In Strabo II 134.

³ XXXVIII 18, 12.

⁴ Or. against Verres, 2, 1, 34. For the idea cf. also Tusc. Disp. I, 20.

⁵ Philip, 120; Panegyricus, 162.

⁶ N. H. VI 216.

⁷ Descriptio Orbis Terrae, 951 ff (775) = Müller, op. cit. II, 185 "propter confinia terrae".

⁸ Numismatic Chronicle, 1885, pp. 38, 48, pl. II, 15, 19; Zeitschrift f. Num. XX p. 273; Head, Historia Numorum, p. 434.

⁹ Rhodes aided Sinope in its successful resistance of Mithradates II in 220 B. C., probably because of commercial friendship; cf. Polyb. IV 56. For Sinopeans in Rhodes cf. I. G. XII 1. (C. I. G. Ins. I.) 465; 466, 467.

¹⁰ Cf. Paus. I 31, 2.

¹¹ Sinope's trade relations with the Greek world were so important that it adopted the Aeginetan standard for the drachma, Six, Num. Chron. 1885, p. 41.

¹² The story of the carrying of the image of Serapis to Egypt, told in Tac. Hist. IV 83, 84 and elsewhere shows this. Clemens, Orat. Adhort. p. 20, says Ptolemy relieved Sinope from famine by a supply of corn. Furthermore we know of a Sinopean Demetrius who was a landowner in Egypt, cf. Amherst Papyri II, no. XLII, LV.

the entire shore from the Thracian Bosphorus¹ to Phasis² and included Heraclea, Cyturus,³ Carambis, Ionopolis, Amisus, Cotyora, Cerasus, Trapezus,⁴ and many other ports. But I am convinced that the volume of direct trade between the northern shore of the Pontus and Sinope has been underrated. The fact is that ancient navigators could cross the Pontus just at this point without losing sight of land for more than a few hours on ordinary days, and on very clear days without losing sight of it at all. Writers like Reinach⁵ assume that the statement of Strabo,⁶ that both the promontory Carambis on the Asiatic side and the promontory Criumetopon at the end of the Crimea could be seen from the middle of the sea, is an instance of the underestimating of maritime distances by the ancients. There is no warrant for this criticism, for both promontories can be seen to-day from the middle of the sea.⁷ This great advantage was available to the ancient navigator neither in the wider westward nor in the eastward third of the sea, but only in the central one. To follow the coast multiplied the distance greatly. Hence, when the route was once established the north shore ships would strike boldly out for the central headlands of Asia Minor and for Sinope, the commercial metropolis of the region. Their goods would then be transhipped in Sinopean bottoms to points further east or west, or would proceed in the same vessels without shifting of cargoes. The statement of Pausanias⁸ that the first fruits of the Hyperboreans of the opposite territories were carried by the Sinopeans to Delos indicates a general commercial route directly across the Pontus. It is well known that coins of Sinope stamped with the device of the eagle grasping the dolphin have been discovered on the northern shore at Olbia,⁹ and I found at Sinope handles of amphoras with the same inscriptions as those found in such

¹ A son of Polydorus, a Sinopean, dwelt in Tomi; cf. *Am. Jour. Arch.* IX (1905), p. 331.

² Polyb. IV 56 says Sinope was situated on the right of the Pontus *παρὰ Φάσιν*.

³ Strabo XII 544 τὸ δὲ Κίτωρον ἐμπόριον ἦν ποτε Σινωπέων.

⁴ Cotyora, Cerasus and Trapezus were colonies of Sinope; cf. *Xen. Anab.* V.

⁵ Reinach-Götz, *op. cit.* p. 56.

⁶ Strabo VII 309, cf. also II 124; *Pliny N. H.* IV 86.

⁷ The officers of Black Sea steamers volunteered this information to me.

⁸ *Paus.* I 31, 2.

⁹ Sengebusch, *op. cit.* p. 34; Streuber, *Sinope* (Basel, 1855) p. 60. The same device, borrowed from Sinope probably, occurs also on coins of Olbia itself. Cf. Hirst, *The Cults of Olbia*, *J. H. S.* XXII p. 263.

large quantities at Olbia.¹ Becker² assumes from the large number excavated there that it was the centre of their manufacture, but an equally large number might perhaps be found by excavations at Sinope and elsewhere. In any case those that I found still further emphasize the commercial relations of Sinope with Olbia and the northern shore. An additional evidence of close connection between the two shores is found in the similarity of personal names.³ Even north shore inscriptions in some cases show the names of Sinopean citizens.⁴ The general impression made by all this evidence is that vessels proceeded from both east and west coastwise to the central section of the sea where it was so much narrower than elsewhere and then turned directly across it, and that a commercial lane was in this way established for the great volume of Black Sea trade, which would thus pass in and out at the fine harbor of Sinope.⁵

A point from which commercial articles were thus distributed by sea was likewise a point toward which converged the various roads by which the products to be exported were brought in and along which at least a certain amount of goods went back to the interior districts. The great caravan routes from India,⁶ and the

¹ Cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX (1905), pp. 294-300.

² *N. Jahrbücher für kl. Phil. Suppl.* X, pp. 67, 108 f.

³ Cf. the *Prosopographia Sinopensis* (to be published in the second part of this paper) with index IV 3 in Latyshev, *Inscriptiones Antiquae Orae Sept. Pont. Eux.*

⁴ Cf. p. 136, note 1; Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 252, from Panticapaeum. Cf. Latyshev op. cit. I 185, II 298, 299; cf. *C. I. L.* III 783; Diodorus XX 25 and Strabo XI 496 also show a close relation between Sinope and the Cimmerian Bosphorus; cf. Reinach-Götz, op. cit. pp. 56, 225. The Sinopean historian Theopompus also was acquainted with the region; cf. Phlegon, *Mirab.* c. 19. Sengebusch op. cit. p. 34, says 'alio titulo Olbiano mentio facta est Theogiti Sinopensium astynomi'. The inscription is on a vase handle *C. I. G.* 2085 b Θεογείτου ἀστυνόμου; Σινωπίων. Both Sengebusch and the *C. I. G.* are in error, for Σινωπίων is the name of the vase-maker; cf. an identical inscription in Becker, *Mélanges Gréco-romaines* I 494, no. 16. For Σινωπίων as a proper name cf. also *N. Jahrbücher f. kl. Phil. Suppl.* IV, p. 472, 38, 39; *Suppl.* V, p. 483, 29; *Suppl.* X, p. 31, 4; p. 35, 17; p. 224, 2. In Streuber op. cit. p. 91 the name of the Sinopean citizen Theocles is wrongly given as Theogeitos.

⁵ This would explain why in Herod. II 34 Sinope is said to be situated opposite the mouth of the Ister. A merchant boat going from the Ister to Phasis or vice versa would avoid the open sea as much as possible and sail by way of Sinope.

⁶ If goods were not brought all the way to Sinope by land, they were taken to Phasis and shipped to Sinope; cf. Reinach-Götz, op. cit. p. 216.

far east followed such rivers as the Euphrates in the south and the Araxes¹ in the north, but as they approached the heart of Asia Minor, the problem was to get the goods through to the Greek and Roman world. Up to the Roman times there was no good road from the East through western Asia Minor to the Aegean. The old Hittite road, afterwards the Persian postal road, served more as a bond between the different parts of the Persian Empire than as a means of transporting goods to Greece. The well-known Ephesus highway was not yet built.² The great eastern system of roads centering in Persia and the great western systems centering in Greece and Rome had no good connecting links at the coast of the Aegean. The solution of the difficulty was in a water route. The best harbor on the southern shore of the Black Sea would become the terminal land point of the great caravans which seem, in sharp contrast to the present, to have contained few, if any, camels. That harbor was Sinope. To this port branch roads were built from the great Persian highways. It is true that Sinope had no good direct connection with the interior, but its shipping facilities were superior and a coastwise road connected it further east with a more favorable point of departure for the interior. Sinope's commerce suffered an inevitable decline when the Roman roads were built and perfected to the great cities of the eastern coast of the Aegean, but in the earlier times the great Persian net-work of lateral and transverse³ lines of transit in Asia Minor may be considered, so far as through travel is concerned, as in the main converging upon the double harbor of Sinope.⁴

A study of the roads in the more immediate general district serves to complete our picture of it as an isolated and strategic point for interior trade connections, having no good landward approaches along the coast except from Amisus. Hecatonymus,

¹ Reinach-Götz, *op. cit.* p. 225.

² Cf. Ramsay, *Hist. Geogr. of Asia Minor*, p. 28; Strabo XII 540; XIV 663.

³ Such a transverse road was that from the Gulf of Issus to Sinope on which Pteria was probably situated; cf. Her. I 72; II 34; but 'an active man' could hardly 'cover the distance in five days'. Cf. also Livy XXXVIII 18; Strabo XIV 664; Ps. Scylax 102; Ps. Scymnus 921 f; Plin. N. H. VI 7, and cf. Athen. Mitt. XXII (1897), p. 3, note 3; Reinach-Götz, *op. cit.* p. 226. Macan, Herodotus (bks. IV-VI) App. XIII, p. 293.

⁴ Cf. a good article on the roads of the Pontus by Munro in the J. H. S. XXI (1901) pp. 52 ff, pl. IV; cf. also Curtius, *Griechische Geschichte*, ed. 5, vol. I, pp. 405, 408.

the Sinopean, whom Xenophon's Ten Thousand met at Cotyora, warned him that only by going back into the interior and over the difficult mountain roads could he get around into Sinope.¹ His representations were so convincing that Xenophon had his army proceed from Cotyora by water. Similar representations no doubt, at least in part, account for his again taking ship from Sinope westward.

It is hardly practicable at present to locate the ancient roads close to Sinope. In exploring the back country I found Roman mile-stones at a distance of perhaps 25 or 30 miles in a southeasterly direction from the town, but they were not in situ, nor were others which I found in other directions.² Nor is it possible to tell how far the Romans built along the old lines or in new directions. But it is probably safe to say in a general way that there were numerous highways good and bad reaching into the interior. Certainly there must have been bridges at certain points upon the Halys.³

It is already evident that the goods shipped in vast quantities at Sinope were the products in part of the immediate locality, in part of the remoter portions of Asia Minor, and in part came from the far east. These last, including jewelry, ivory, bronzes and oriental luxuries in general,⁴ do not especially concern us here, and in attempting to classify Sinope's exports we shall confine ourselves to articles from its immediate neighborhood and from those interior regions of Asia Minor which found their most immediate natural outlet at Sinope. Neglecting numerous minor items such as nuts,⁵ hides,⁶ grain (small in quantity as compared

¹ Xen. Anab. V 6, 3 ff.; B. C. H. 1901, p. 41 ff.; Reinach-Götz, op. cit. p. 232; Ainsworth, Travels in Asia Minor, vol. I, p. 92.

² Cf. Am. J. Arch. IX (1905), p. 328 f, nos. 75-79. The beginning of no. 75 can be restored by means of J. H. S. XX (1900), p. 163, no. 7 and C. I. L. III, 6895. Read Imp. Caes. C. Aur. Val.] Diocl[etiano P(io) F(elici) Invicto Aug. et Imp. Caes. M. Aur. Val.] M[aximia]n[o]. The latter part of no. 75 refers to the three sons of Constantine the Great. So in next to last line read Fl. Co(n)sta(nte) nob(ilissimis) C(aesaribus). In no. 76, in which we have a case of praes(es) used in a technical sense before Diocletian, we should expect in l. 5 filio eius et N. Aur. Num(eriano). But the inscription is carelessly cut.

³ E. g. the bridge which was regarded as a wonder by the Greeks, Ramsay, op. cit. p. 31; Herod. I 75.

⁴ Perrot et Chipiez, Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité, V, p. 198.

⁵ Athen. II 54 d; Hehn, Kultur-pflanzen und Haustiere, 6th ed., p. 380.

⁶ Cf. Dem. XXXIV 10; Strabo, XI 493.

with the product of the northern shore), honey, wax,¹ stones for gems² etc. we mention:

1. Fish. The tunny was most important. Its great spawning ground was the vast swampy shores of the palus Maeotis. Strabo³ says that, while still exceedingly small, the shoals made their way along the coast in an easterly and southerly direction. By the time they reached Trapezus and Pharnacia they were of considerable size and the first catch was at these points. But those that got round to Sinope, were much larger and the hauls were immense, though neither fish nor catch was so large as at Byzantium. These fish were salted or pickled and sent to Greece, where they were a staple article of diet for the common people.⁴ There seems to have been an extraordinary difference in price between Greece and Rome, for, however common and cheap they were in Greece, Diodorus quotes the price of Pontic fish at Rome as 400 drachmae for a small jarful.⁵ There is a vast wealth of other edible fish in the Pontus,⁶ such as sturgeon, mackerel, turbot, mullet⁷ and dolphin. But ancient literature seems to mention only the last two as caught at Sinope and indeed the last only for its oil and the medicinal value of its liver.

2. Timber. The country around Sinope was covered in ancient times, as it is to-day, with a splendid growth of timber which was utilized for two main purposes, ship-building and the manufacture of furniture.⁸ The ship-timber of the Euxine was celebrated among the ancients.⁹ If Horace's ship of state were to have the utmost staunchness, it must be *Pontica pinus*, *Silvae filia nobilis*

¹ Polyb. IV 38; Aristotle, *Περὶ θανμασίῳν ἰκονσμμάτων*, 831, c. XVII.

² Strabo XII 540; Plin. XXXVI 12, 45; XXXVII 37. For other such articles of export which came mostly from the interior, cf. Sengebusch, op. cit. p. 19 ff. and in general on the exports of Sinope cf. Sengebusch, op. cit. p. 16 ff. and Streuber, op. cit. p. 50; Reinach-Götz, op. cit. p. 227 f.

³ Strabo VII 320. Cf. also Arist. Hist. An. 598 f. IX 13; Plin. N. H. IX 15, 47-52; Strabo XII 545 *πηλαμυνδεία θανμαστά*, words still used in Sinope; XII 549; Aelian IV 9; IX 59; XV 3, 5 and 10; Ritter, op. cit. p. 794 ff.; Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums, II 345.

⁴ Cf. Polyb. IV 38; cf. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Gr. Privataltertümer, ed. 3, p. 227, notes 1 and 2.

⁵ Diod. XXXVII 3, 5; Reinach-Götz, op. cit. p. 223 wrongly says 300 drachmae.

⁶ For a list of the fish in the Pontus, cf. Pliny, N. H. XXXII 11 ff.

⁷ Cf. Athenaeus III 118 c; VII 307 b for Sinopic mullets (*κεστροίς*).

⁸ Strabo XII 546; Theophr. Histor. Plant. IV 5, 5.

⁹ Catullus IV 9-13; Verg. Georg. II 437.

(Od. I 14, 11). Great quantities of ship-timber doubtless found their way from the northern shore of the Pontus to Greece by way of Panticapaeum, but there must have been a long period when, as Strabo indicates, the forests of the neighborhood of Sinope sent out through its harbor a large quota of the same material. These heavy exports, however, probably were not made until after the time of Alexander, for according to Thucydides,¹ the store-house of ship-timber seems previously to have been in the much nearer forests of Thrace and Macedonia.

As the oak and pine were used for the construction of vessels, so the maple and walnut were worked into furniture such as couches, and tables.² The maple seems to have been held in peculiarly high estimation, tables made from it being ranked second to the citrus tables only.³

3. Olive-oil. Although, as we have stated (p. 129), Sinope was the westward limit of the olive, it nevertheless grew abundantly in the neighborhood of that town itself,⁴ and the districts east of it would bring their product thither for export. The exports of Sinope thus competed with those of the more southern countries, such as Greece,⁵ in supplying Cappadocia and the western section of the southern shore of the Pontus together with the whole northern coast.⁶

4. Red Earth or Bole. This substance was, in the main at least, iron calcined or oxidized into a soft moist clay. The ancients gave it many names, such as *μίλτος* and minium.⁷ The common appellation, *Σινωπῆς*, shows that Sinope was regarded as the

¹ Thuc. IV 108; cf. also Hermann, op. cit. p. 436, note 3.

² Cf. Strabo l. c.; Eust. Com. 773; Pliny, N. H. XII 31; Theophr. Histor. Plant. III 3, 1; II 1, 2; V 3, 3; 7, 6 etc.; Hor. Sat. 2, 8, 10; Martial 14, 90; Blümner, Gewerbl. Thätigk. 33, 44, 46, 70, 80. Cf. Ransom, Couches and Beds of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans, pp. 39, 55. The same wood is used to-day by the Turks for the same purpose.

³ Pliny, N. H. XVI 26; Cic. Verr. IV 17.

⁴ Cf. Strabo XII 545, 546; II 71, 73; Eust. II. II 853.

⁵ Polyb. IV 38.

⁶ Melitene alone in Cappadocia had the olive; cf. Strabo XII 535. For the lack of the olive on the north shore of the Pontus cf. Strabo II 73, 74; for the climate cf. Herod. IV 28; Theophr. De Causis Plant. V 12, 11.

⁷ Strictly speaking, minium is to be distinguished, for it contains oxide of lead. But *μίλτος* and minium are often confounded, as by Strabo XII 540; cf. also Pliny N. H. XXXIII 36 f.

main place of export.¹ It is found near Sinope, and in Cappadocia its general abundance stains the Halys so deeply that the Turkish name for that stream is Kizil Irmak (red river).

This earthy substance existed, of course, in various other localities of the ancient world. Its importance as an article of trade and commerce is evident from the Athenian monopoly of the Cean product,² from the sealed packages used for the Lemnian article,³ and from the care with which different grades of it are enumerated.⁴ The most important were the Cean, the Lemnian, and the Sinopean. Theophrastus⁵ considers the Cean product better than the others. Pliny⁶ ranks the Lemnian and the Sinopean highest, whereas Strabo⁷ marks the quality of the latter as finest, and an interesting papyrus⁸ gives convincing details of its superiority in weight, rich liver color, moisture, and freedom from grit. The importance of this homely article of Sinopean commerce is indicated by its numerous and heterogeneous uses.⁹ Its colors varied, but some were intense enough to furnish a kind of red ink. It was used as a mineral paint and as an ingredient in other paints, being applied to houses, ships, and wood-work generally. Its more artistic employments were in decorating furniture, wood-carving, terra-cotta figurines and even statues. It was no unimportant part of the ancient *materia medica*, being applied externally as a kind of mud-bath and even taken internally for various diseases specifically listed by Pliny. An architect who desired to use the best material would stipulate in his speci-

¹ Strabo, l. c. *ὠνομάσθη δὲ Σινωπικὴ διότι κατάγειν ἐκεῖσε εἰώθεσαν οἱ ἔμποροι*; Theophr. De Lapidibus 52, *κατάγεται εἰς Σινώπην*; Pliny N. H. XXXV 13. Sinopis inventa primum in Ponto est; inde nomen a Sinope urbe.

² I. G. II (CIA II), 546.

³ Pliny, N. H. XXXV 14.

⁴ Pliny, N. H. XXXV 13. ⁵ De Lap. 52.

⁶ L. c. ⁷ Strabo, XII 540.

⁸ Leemans, Papyri Graeci Lugduni-Batavi X 15, 11, 12, 15. Ibid. X 311 tells how *Sinopis* can be mixed with gold, half and half, to double the amount of the latter.

⁹ Pliny, N. H. XXXV 12, 13, 17, 24, 32; Vitruv. VII 7; Diosc. V 111; Cels. De Medicina V 6, 6; VI 6, 19; Hesychius s. *μίλτος*; Eust. Com. 1166; Boeckh, Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener II³ p. 315 f.; Blümner, Technologie und Terminologie IV, p. 480 f. For ships cf. *μυλοπάρηοι νῆες* in Homer; Pliny, N. H. XXXIII 38; Herod. III 58; Hermann, op. cit. p. 489, note 8. For the use of *μίλτος* for terra-cottas cf. Lucian Lexiph. 22; B. C. H. XIV (1890), p. 503, n. 3; Monuments Piot IV (1898), p. 214; for statues Paus. II 2, 6; Plut. Quaest. Roman., 98, p. 287 b; Xen. Oecon. 10, 5; Hermann, op. cit. p. 201 n. 3. Ladies used it for painting their faces; Guhl und Koner, Leben der Griechen und Römer, p. 316.

fications that certain structural lines be drawn with a pigment made of clean oil and Sinopic earth.¹ I noted at Corinth crosses made with *Sinopsis* to indicate the position for columns² not now in situ, and lines drawn with it to indicate how far blocks of stone were to overlap the stones in the course below.³ In excavations at Miletus the separated drums of columns showed that this substance mixed with oil had been used as a cement.

5. Iron and Steel. At a general distance of about two hundred miles east of Sinope the coast range of mountains draws very near the sea. The whole district is rich in copper, iron, and, in ancient times, even silver⁴. Here the Sinopeans, doubtless attracted by the rich deposits, founded a prosperous colony. Part of the ore was evidently worked into iron and steel implements at Cotyora. But another part was doubtless shipped to the mother-city Sinope to the manufacturers there; for Sinopic steel⁵ was equally celebrated with the Chalybian, Lydian, and Laconian; and it was made into carpenters' tools, whereas the Spartan was used for files, augers, dies and stone-cutters' tools, and the Lydian for similar things, including knives and swords. Hamilton⁶ thinks he has located the ancient mines of the Chalybians at Unieh. But in any case the steel that passed through the port of Sinope was of the finest quality.

6. Live Stock. There is abundant evidence that Cappadocia and Paphlagonia itself nourished great numbers of sheep, goats, mules, horses and other domestic animals.⁷ If we put with this fact the statement of Polybius that live stock was extensively exported from the Pontus, it becomes evident that shipments of this kind were large at Sinope. The word Polybius⁸ uses

¹ I. G. VII (I. G. Sept. I), 3073 = Dittenberger Syl.² no. 540, ll. 155-160. The price was three or three and a half obols per *στατήρ*, cf. I, G. II, 834^b, col. I, l. 12 (p. 522) and col. II, l. 48 (p. 526).

² As in the long south stoa (Am. J. Arch. VI 1902), Suppl. p. 19.

³ As in the Greek temple near Pirene, Ibid. pl. XVII, the Greek building with a round end (not yet published), the Old Spring, the round basis above the spring (ibid. pl. VII), and elsewhere. So *Sinopsis* was used in Greek buildings as well as in Roman buildings of the Republic. It was also found used for the same purposes in fourth century buildings at Epidaurus and Lesbos.

⁴ Strabo XII 549; Virg. Georg. I 58; Apoll. Rhod. II 1005 f.

⁵ Steph. Byz. s. v. *Λακεδαιμίων*, Schol. II. XIII 218; Eustathius 294, 5 on II. II 582; Blümner, Gewerbl. Thätigk. p. 41; Müller, Frag. Hist. Graec. II 442, 9, frag. from Daimachus. For artisans etc. at Sinope cf. Polyaen. VII 21, 2; Diog. Laer. VI 20.

⁶ Op. cit., pp. 244, 257. ⁷ Strabo XI 525; Eust. Com. 970. ⁸ IV 38.

(θρέμματα) as employed in the classifications of the Greeks, included slaves (CIG 1709). Lucian (Alex. 9, 15, 17, 45) speaks of slaves as differing only in form from cattle. The Paphlagonian slave is a frequent figure in the comedies of Aristophanes. The picture of Sinope's commerce must include its traffic in the human species; droves of captive men and women passed down to its fine harbor and were carried in ships to meet the sneers of the cultivated comic poets of Athens.

So great a volume of exports implies a certain amount of imports. Salt came from Olbia¹ and from the interior of Asia Minor² and wine³ from Greece, objects of art also such as statues⁴ and vases, and in general such refinements of the west as well as of the east as the somewhat defective Sinopean culture would demand.

CHAPTER IV.

THE FOUNDING OF SINOPE.

A city of such impregnability, located in so productive a region, and at the natural gate-way of so vast a commerce, would of course be coveted and fought for. It would have its political vicissitudes, its general culture, and its religious cults. It would develop its great men. It would weave its name into Greek and Latin literature and leave its record in figured coins and in inscriptions on stone. In a word, it would have its history, of which, in this and several succeeding chapters, we aim to give an account.

The uncertain figures of Assyrians move in the mist of its primitive records. There is a Milesian dawn of Greek colonial light quickly clouded by Cimmerian darkness and then rekindled. Then come the nearly blank annals of some one hundred and eighty years on whose last pages the figure of a barbarian tyrant becomes distinct. The Attic rescue follows and the reinforcement by Pericles' six hundred new colonists. Democratic independence displaces tyrannic subjection at Sinope. Anon its colonial dependencies are disturbed and excited by Xenophon's Ten Thousand who have forced their way from the heart of Asia to the sea and

¹ Herod. IV 53; Dio Chrysost. XXXVI 437.

² Strabo XII 546, 560, 561; Eust. Com. 784.

³ Polyb. IV 38.

⁴ Such as the statue of Autolycus by Sthennis, cf. Plut. Luc. 23.

along its shore. The great cynic matures the fearless powers which Athens admired, and the comic poets who woke its laughter, bringing Sinopean culture to its flower in the motherland, arise. With Rhodian help its fortifications resist the engines of Mithradates II, but fall before the sudden onset of Pharnaces, his son. The power of the Pontic conquerors brings Sinope to the climax of its political strength under Mithradates the Great, whose linguistic acquirements were only second to his great military genius, which baffled the utmost power of Rome for nearly half a century. Then come the days of the inevitable Roman yoke, in passing under which Sinope joins the universal procession. Then the intricate entanglements of the Middle Ages and finally the present Turkish dominion.

There is no evidence that the early Phoenicians were at Sinope. The whole main course of the Phoenician commercial empire took its way westward. Its northern and southern movements were only short spurs thrown out of the main range. Although there is at present in the north-western portion and outside the walls by the Turkish Hospital and school, Idadie, and near the water a quarter of the city called Φοινικίδα, a late local imagination, thinking of the spot as one to which the Phoenicians would naturally come, may in a fanciful spirit have given it its name. Or the name may be due to the palm tree there.

The early foundations of Sinope are probably Assyrian. The extreme antiquity of that great power is constantly receiving fresh evidence. The code of Hammurabi is dated ca. 2250 B. C. and it seems evident that more than a millennium later in about 1100 B. C. the Assyrian power swept westward through Asia Minor to the Mediterranean. It is incredible that it should not at more than one point have forced its way through the openings in the coastwise mountains to the shore of the Pontus. Its kings have left no monuments along the sea reciting their personal conquests¹, but other evidence of the presence of their subjects is not wanting. In later times, in the seventh century according to Nöldeke², the Assyrian power still extended beyond Sinope

¹ Gelzer's argument (*Zeitschrift f. äg. Sprache* 1874, p. 118 f) that Mat-qui (shore-village) which occurs in Assyrian inscriptions, refers to Sinope, is inconclusive, for the word might be intended for almost any coast town in Asia Minor. On p. 119 he goes far astray when he says qui or kui comes from the name of the founder, Κῶιος, transposing the lines in Scymnus to suit his theory.

² Cf. his article on Ἀσσύριος, Σύριος, Σύρος in *Hermes* V 443 ff.

and Furtwängler thinks of Sinope, as being at about that time the mediating agent by which Assyrian elements, such as griffins' heads and winged human busts on bronze vessels (cf. Olympia Bd. IV, Die Bronzen) came to Greece.¹ Coming down to later times, we recognize the persistence of its Assyrian origin in Sinopic coins with Aramaic inscriptions;² in Avienus' mention of a "second Syria reaching as far as Sinope";³ in Tzetzes' vague statement that "everybody calls Sinope Assyria";⁴ in the legends that the nymph Sinope was the mother of Syros from whom the Syrians got their name, and that she was carried off from Assyria;⁵ in the existence at Sinope even now of a sarcophagus with a Greek inscription indicating that a man named Syrios was buried in it;⁶ and in the fact that the promontory mentioned above (page 126) was called Syrias.

The name Sinope itself evidently antedates Greek settlement, for mythology and tradition indicate, not the colonizing of an uninhabited locality, so much as the taking of the place from previous inhabitants. Strabo⁷ says that Autolycus took possession of (*κατέσχε*) Sinope, a word whose usage generally indicates seizure or capture. Plutarch⁸ says outright that Autolycus took the town from the Syrians. Apollonius of Rhodes⁹ says that the Argonauts came to the Assyrian land where Zeus had established Sinope, daughter of Asopus, etc. In listing those who in early times inhabited Sinope, Ps. Scymnus¹⁰ speaks of "Sinope, a city named after one of the Amazons, who dwell near by, which formerly the native-born¹¹ Assyrians inhabited, and afterwards the Greeks who went against the Amazons, Autolycus and

¹ Meyer s. Kappadokien in Ersch und Grüber, Encyclopädie and in his Geschichte des Altertums II, p. 225 says there is no monumental evidence. But Furtwängler holds there is, cf. Die Antiken Gemmen III, p. 68.

² Cf. Six, Numismatic Chronicle, 1885 and 1893, p. 7; cf. also Head, Hist. Num. and Brit. Mus. Cat.

³ Müller, Geogr. Min. II, p. 187, vs. 1153.

⁴ Chiliad. 12, 917 τὴν δὲ Σινώπην σύμπαντες καλοῦσιν Ἀσσυρίαν.

⁵ Eust. in Müller, Geogr. Min. II, pp. 352-353, §775 f; Eudocia's Ἰωνία DCCCLXII; Diodorus IV 72, 1, 2; Schol. Apoll. Rhod. II 948; Et. Mag. s. Σινώπη.

⁶ Cf. Am. J. Arch. IX (1905), p. 315.

⁷ XII 545.

⁸ Plut. Luc. 23.

⁹ Argonautica II 948 ff; cf. also Scholium and Herod. II 104.

¹⁰ Vs. 941-952 (Müller, Geogr. Min. I, p. 236).

¹¹ I adopt Meineke's emendation, ἐγγενεῖς.

Deileon and Phlogius, Thessalians". Scylax¹ in a loose way calls Sinope a place in Assyria. Winckler's² conjecture that "Leucosyri" did not originally mean white Assyrians, as Strabo³ thinks, but rather incorporates a corruption of "Lukki", the name of certain Assyrians mentioned in the Tell-El-Amarna tablets, is unlikely. The Assyrians of the north were probably of a lighter complexion than those of the south.

The derivation of the name Sinope perhaps goes back to the Assyrian deity Sin, the moon-god, whose numerical symbol was thirty, in allusion to the period of the moon, and who was the patron of brick-making and building. The worship of the moon along the southern shore of the Pontus was more important than elsewhere in the Greek world.⁴ Assyrians were perpetually compounding the names of towns and persons with the name of the God Sin, and in view of the powerful early influence of Assyria, nothing is more likely than that Sinope would be one more example of such compounds.

If now we recognize the founding of Sinope as Assyrian⁵ it will not seem difficult to dispose of the prominent and persistent myth concerning the nymph Sinope. Greek writers would prefer a Greek to an Assyrian origin of their colony. Although such an etymology has not been mentioned before, I venture to connect the name with *σίνωμαι*, to seize or carry off. This would be the most natural connection of "Sinope" for those who found the word already on the ground and were ignorant of or wished to ignore its Assyrian etymology. On this derivation may have been built up the manifold forms of the rape of the nymph Sinope. Hardly anything is constant in the story except the item of seizure. The God who carries her off is sometimes Zeus, sometimes Apollo, sometimes Poseidon, sometimes the river-God Halys. Her parents are sometimes Asopus and Metope, sometimes Ares and

¹ Scylacis Caryandensis Periplus 89 (Müller, *ibid.* p. 66). So also Nicephorus (Müller, *Geogr. Gr. Min.* II, p. 464) and Nicolaus Damascenus (*Hist. Graeci Minores* ed. Dindorf) p. 32, 7.

² Winckler, *Die Thontafeln von Tell-El-Amarna* (Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* Bd. V) 28, 10: Winckler, *Die Völker Vorderasiens* (*Der Alte Orient*, vol. I), p. 23.

³ XII 544, XVI 737.

⁴ Cf. Roscher s. v. Luna, especially the worship of *Μῆν Φαρνάκου*. In one of the inscriptions I discovered at Sinope Selene is mentioned along with Helios and Hermes and other deities, cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX (1905), p. 323.

⁵ And this is the opinion of Blau, *op.cit.*, Mövers, *Die Phönizier*, and others, though not of most modern scholars.

Aegina or Parnasse. Sometimes she is carried off from Assyria and sometimes from Boeotia.¹ Sometimes she deceives her captor by exacting a blank promise to give her whatever she should ask and afterwards fills in the blank with her own virginity. Sometimes she has children. But she is always seized and carried off. And this unfailing feature seems to show the source of all the stories to be in the already present but misinterpreted name of the town.²

To this Assyrian town the enterprising Greeks of Miletus, attracted by the mineral wealth of the eastward shores and led to the location by the advantages of its harbor, penetrated at a very early period. The date is difficult to fix, but may perhaps be approximated in the following fashion. Sinope must have existed before 756,³ for Trapezus, its colony,⁴ was founded in that year. Eumelus of Corinth, moreover, in writing up the Argonautic expedition, enriched it with geographical details which included Sinope by name. There is nothing extant of this work of Eumelus, but his mention of the town is cited by the Schol. Apoll. Rhod. II 946. Now Eumelus wrote in the latter half of the eighth century B. C. Sinope must therefore have been reached by Greeks before that time. Thus again we are pointed to some period in the first half of the eighth century such as Eusebius' date (II 80 e Schöne) for Trapezus indicates, at least thirty or thirty-five years earlier than 756 B. C., 790 or 785 B. C.,⁵ thus leaving a few years

¹ Probably because the Minyans, with whom the Argonautic expedition was associated, dwelt in Boeotia.

² Cf. Plut. Luc. 23; Apoll. Rhod. II 946-967. The scholia to the latter (Müller, Frag. Hist. Graec. II 161; 348, 2; III 29, 3), give excerpts about the nymph Sinope from Andron of Halicarnassus, Andron of Teos, Artemidorus, Eumelus, Aristotle, Hecataeus, and Philostephanus. Cf. also V. Flaccus, Argon. V 106-120; Dionysius Per. vs. 772-779 (Müller, Geogr. Gr. Min. II p. 153); scholia to Dion. Per. (Müller, *ibid.* II, p. 453); Eust. Com. 772-774 (Müller, *ibid.* II, p. 351); Nicephorus, *Γεωγραφία συνοπτική*, 782 f. (Müller, *ibid.* II, p. 464); Diodorus IV 72, 1, 2; Ps. Scymni Periegesis, vs. 941 f. (Müller, *ibid.* I 236); Avienus, vs. 951 f. (Müller, *ibid.* II 185); Et. Mag. s. v. *Σινώπη*; Eudocia's *Ἰωνία* DCCCLXII, *περὶ Σινώπης*. Sometimes Sinope appears as an Amazon and the story is told that she drank much and hence was called *Σινώπη*, which in the Thracian dialect (which the Amazons spoke) means "drinking much". And Sinope is a corruption of Sanape; cf. the above references.

³ Eusebius, Vers. Arm. Ol. 6, 1; Hieronymus, Ol. 6, 1.

⁴ Xen. Anab. IV 8, 22.

⁵ Curtius, Gr. Geschichte I, 6 p. 407, puts the first foundation in 790 B. C.; Abbott, A History of Greece, I, p. 340 about 770 B. C.; Duncker, Gesch. d. Altert. I, 5 p. 462, 466; V 507 and Büchner, Die Besiedelung der Küsten des

of prosperity before the Cimmerian inroad in 782 mentioned by Orosius,¹ in which probably Habrondas,² its leader, was killed.³ We must assume that Sinope revived after the destroying nomad tide had swept through in order to account for its founding of Trapezus in 756. What the fortunes of the Greek contingent were for the subsequent century and more, we have no means of knowing. They probably included many vicissitudes connected with the various incursions of the Cimmerians from the northern shore,⁴ one of which penetrated even to Sardis, surprising and plundering the town, and another to Magnesia. However, in 635 B. C., there seems to have been an extraordinarily strong and powerful body of these barbarians driven down by the still stronger nomad Scythians. This body all but destroyed Sinope,⁵ so that its reinforcement in 630 or 629, according as we follow Hieronymus or Eusebius (II 89 n Schöne) was looked upon as a second founding, and Sinope, like Cyzicus, was said to have been founded twice.⁶

Pontos Euxeinos durch die Milesier, p. 49 and Streuber op. cit. about 785. Grote, History of Greece II² 191, note 64 considers improbable the foundation of a Milesian colony at so early a period. Perhaps the first colony was only a small settlement for trade; cf. Busolt, Gr. Gesch. I, p. 466 and Reinach-Götz, op. cit. p. 18. Beloch, Gr. Gesch., says nothing about the first founding; cf. I, p. 192-3 for second founding. Holm, The History of Greece I, p. 275 and Meyer, Gesch. des Altert. I 406 and II 285 give both colonies. There is a great deal of uncertainty about this early period of Greek history and we cannot be sure of dates; but the evidence, including Scymnus whose source, Demetrius of Callatia, was good, points to a double founding.

¹ I 21.

² The name of the leader is variously given. Habrondas seems more likely to be correct than Ambron or Abron. Meineke, Step. Byz. (Berlin, 1849), p. 571 made the suggestion.

³ Ps. Scymnus V 947.

⁴ For the Cimmerians cf. Herod. IV 11, 12; I 6, 15, 16; Strabo, I 1, 6; I 2, 20; I 3, 61; III 2, 149; XI 494; XIV 648.

⁵ Herod. IV 12 says φαίνονται δὲ οἱ Κιμμέριοι φεύγοντες ἐς τὴν Ἀσίην τοῦς Σκύθας καὶ τὴν Χερσόνησον κτίσαντες, ἐν τῇ νῦν Σινώπῃ πόλις Ἑλλὰς οἰκισται. The νῦν does not necessarily mean that no Greek city existed when the Cimmerians came, as Grote and Busolt loc. cit. think. There may have been a weak settlement there at the time.

⁶ The second founding was by Cretines and Cous (cf. Phlegon in Müller, Frag. Hist. Graec. III 605, 6; Eust. ad Dionys. Com. 772; and Ps. Scymnus v. 949.) Acc. to Ps. Scymnus loc. cit., it took place ἡνίκα ὁ Κιμμερίων κατέδραμε τὴν Ἀσίαν στρατός, that is, in the epoch year of the capture of Sardis (657), cf. Rohde, Rhein. Mus. XXXIII 200. If this date is right, then it was not the inroad of the Cimmerians in 635 but an earlier one which settled at Sinope.

The few definite points which we have thus far been able to deduce with anything like certainty, and the dearth of any records at all to cover nearly two succeeding centuries, may naturally occasion scepticism as to there having been any such early founding at all by the Greeks. But the extreme antiquity of the stories of the Argonauts and of Heracles' expedition against the Amazons, both of which have for their scenes the shore of the Black Sea, and in both of which Autolycus, the recognized founder of Sinope, and his companions had part,¹ joins with the strong tradition we have been using to assure us that we are dealing with an historic, even if not with a precisely ascertained, founding of the great Euxine trading port.

CHAPTER V.

DARK AGES AND RENAISSANCE.

Even after Sinope's refounding in 630 its records for nearly two centuries are for the most part blank annals. The Lydian monarchy rose, reached the Halys, and fell. But whether its broad lines of display and vanity penetrated the mountain passes and subjected the shore cities is left in doubt.² Pteria taken by Croesus lay 150 miles to the south and there are no records of any further northward march. Cyrus broke the Lydian power about 550 B. C.; but how soon or how decisively the Persian power subdued the Greek cities of the southern coast of the Euxine is unwritten. Xerxes' expedition in 480 B. C. included

¹ Cf. Pauly-Wissowa, *Encycl.* II 763 ff. Only Strabo, XII 545, (source perhaps Eumelus) makes Autolycus a comrade of Jason. Cf. also Apollod. I, 9, 16, 8. Plut. *Luc.* 23 says that "Autolycus, son of Deimachus, was on the expedition of Heracles from Thessaly against the Amazons. When he was returning with Demoleon and Phlogius he was shipwrecked at Sinope and took the city away from the Syrians". Appian *Mithr.* XII 83 says the same. Cf. also Ps. Scymnus v. 944 f; Anon *Peripl. Pont. Eux.* 22. Apollonius of Rhodes combines the two traditions and (II 948-967) says that the sons of Deimachus, Deileon, Autolycus and Phlogius, comrades of Heracles, were picked up by the Argonauts when they came there. V. Flaccus, V 106-120 and Hyg. *Fab.* 14 have the same. Phlogius is mentioned in an inscription found at Sinope, cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX (1905) p. 306, no. 31. On these heroes cf. Roscher's *Lexicon* and Büchner, *op. cit.* p. 58 and on the Argonauts in general the dissertation by Grüger, *Die Argonauten-Sage* (Breslau, 1889). For Heracles at Sinope cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX (1905) p. 305.

² Cf. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* I § 487, who thinks not.

among its total of 1200 ships 80 contributed by the Greeks on the Hellespont and the Pontus.¹ It is natural to suppose that Sinope was represented among the eighty, but there is no written evidence of such a fact. Some few rude² coins bearing an eagle and a dolphin and a mere incuse square on the reverse are archaic enough to represent this obscure period of Sinope's story when the great tides of conquest were sweeping to and fro far south of its mountain fences.

In the fifth century relief expeditions began to be sent to the Greek cities of the Black Sea which were under tribute to Persia. Aristides, about 470, did not get so far as Sinope. But later, probably soon after 444,³ in the flowering time of Athens, Pericles, with the design of making a display of Athenian power, and in order to relieve the Greek cities on the Euxine from oppression and to stimulate their trade with Attica, led forth an expedition which reached Sinope. Here he left the efficient Lamachus with thirteen ships and assigned him the task of expelling the tyrant Timesilaus.⁴ The man⁵ who at Syracuse advised the Athenians to fight at once seems to have performed his task with characteristic promptness, and not long afterwards it was voted at Athens that six hundred volunteer colonists should sail for Sinope to occupy the houses and lands of the defeated tyrant and his following. Lamachus can hardly have remained long at Sinope: we find him in 424 B. C. leading another Black Sea expedition which was

¹ Diod. XI 3.

² Num. Zeitschrift II, p. 259; Six, Num. Chron. 1885, pp. 8, 9, 19, 20.

³ Abbott, A History of Greece, II, p. 375, says "after 449 B. C.". Köhler, Urk. zur Gesch. d. Delisch-Attisch. Bundes., p. 114 f. puts the expedition in the year 453. Duncker, Des Perikles' Fahrt in den Pontus (Sitzungsberichte der Berl. Acad., XXVII 1885), p. 536, gives the year 444/3 B. C. Busolt, Griech. Geschichte II 538 (ed. of 1888), gave the same date but later, in III 585, n. 2, argues against this date and gives 436/5 B. C. Beloch, Gr. Gesch. I 504, gives the same date. Meyer, Gesch. des Alt. IV 430, says after 440. Kirchner, Prosopogr. Att. 11811 gives 437 B. C. But I see no conclusive reason for putting the expedition so late. Plut. Per. 20, places it immediately after that to the Chersonesus in 447. If we accept the date 436 there are 34 years between the first and second expeditions and only 12 between the second and third. In 415 Lamachus was 50 or 55 years old (cf. Plut. Alcib. 18). That would make him about 25 or 30 years old at the time of the expedition to the Pontus, if it was circ. 440.

⁴ Plut. Per. 20.

⁵ Cf. Busolt, l. c., for the identification of Lamachus, who died in 414 before Syracuse, with the man left in Sinope by Pericles.

wrecked at Heraclea.¹ But from this time Sinope's condition was greatly improved, even its coins showing much finer workmanship.²

Between Lamachus' deposition of the tyrant Timesilaus about 444 B. C. and the Peace of Antalcidas, which deliberately left the Euxine Greeks at the mercy of Persia, lies Sinope's golden day of autonomous prosperity and power.³ Not that we possess the direct recital of it, but the indirect evidence is conclusive. When Xenophon's veterans climbed the coast range and saw the sea, it was Trapezus, a colony of Sinope, that lay directly beneath their eye on the coast.⁴ Although some 250 miles east of Sinope, it owed allegiance to it and paid tribute in common with Cerasus and Cotyora.⁵ That Sinope's colonial arm reached so far may not indeed warrant Perrot and Chipiez⁶ in calling Sesamus, Cytorus, and Ionopolis actual colonies of Sinope, and "multiplied" harbors may be too strong an expression; but it is evident that Sinope had a firm colonial system covering nearly the whole southern shore of the Euxine. Its compactness is illustrated in the speech made to Xenophon by Hecatonymus, who had come all the way from Sinope to deal with the Ten Thousand when he says⁷ "These (Cotyrites) and the people of Cerasus and Trapezus bring us an appointed tribute; so that whatever harm you do them, the city of the Sinopeans considers that it suffers it itself". There may have been a lack of Greek unity in the failure of the Cotyrites to receive the Ten Thousand more cordially, but Xenophon's soldiers appear to have behaved somewhat roughly and the colonists may well have been suspicious⁸ of so large and powerful

¹ Thuc. IV 75.

² Six, Num. Chron. 1885, p. 21.

³ Strabo, XII 546, seems to extend Sinope's autonomous period far onward to the capture of the city by Pharnaces in 183 B. C. But either he wrote in partial ignorance of the results of the Peace of Antalcidas or the autonomy he had in mind was a partial and defective one; for, not to speak of other evidence, the embassy to Darius with which we deal in the next chapter shows a clearly acknowledged general submission to Persia.

⁴ Xen. Anab. IV 8, 22.

⁵ Xen. Anab. V 5, 10. The inhabitants of these two places were later deported by Pharnaces to form Pharnacia, cf. also Diod. XIV 30, 3; Ps. Scymnus 910; Strabo XII 545 f.; and Bürchner, Die Besiedelung des Pontos Euxeinos durch die Milesier, pp. 56-66.

⁶ Histoire de l'Art, V, p. 197.

⁷ Xen. l. c.

⁸ A similar feeling may account for Xenophon's ships going a few miles past Sinope to Armene, as though there were an objection to his anchoring, as he naturally would, at that excellent harbor itself. Cf. Xen. Anab. VI 1, 15.

a force with so adventurous a history back of them. In any case the incident does not affect our view of the unity of Sinope's colonies among themselves. A further evidence of Sinope's independence, may be seen in Xenophon's warning¹ to Hecatonymus against an alliance of the Sinopeans with the Paphlagonians. His words presuppose the desire of the Paphlagonians to get possession of Sinope and their inability hitherto to do so.

The numismatic testimony is interesting. We now for the first time find Sinopean coins bearing the names of magistrates,² or rather the first letters of the names. The inscription on one is EK, which suggests Hecatonymus³, on another XOPH which suggests *Χορηγίων* and on another ΛΕΩΜ which probably stands for *Λεωμέδων*.⁴ Their variety, too, points to a democratic form of government. This series comes abruptly to an end a few decades later, and is supplanted by the inferior minting of Data-mes, which itself is followed by a still poorer coinage with Aramaic inscriptions, some specimens of which bear the names of Ariarathes and Abdsasan (not Abdemon).⁵ But short-lived as the Greek magistrates' coinage was, it bears mute testimony to Sinope's brief autonomy.

There is, moreover, a passage of Strabo which, I think, must be referred to this period and discloses in a brief but effective way the sea power of Sinope. Xenophon⁶ shows us that Sinope with the help of Heraclea, could upon occasion supply ships enough to transport his large force to westward points. But Strabo⁷ says: *κατασκευασαμένη δὲ ναυτικὸν ἐπήρχε τῆς ἐντὸς Κυνανέων θαλάττης, καὶ ἔξω δὲ πολλῶν ἀγώνων μετείχε τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν.*

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

¹ Anab. V 5, 23. Cf. Judeich, *Kleinasiatische Studien*, pp. 40, 260.

² Six, *Num. Chron.* 1885, p. 50 gives a list of them.

³ Six, *Num. Chron.* 1885, p. 24.

⁴ Cf. *Am. J. Arch.* IX (1905), pp. 298, 306, 313.

⁵ Cf. Six, *op. cit.* p. 25.

⁶ Anab. V 6 ff.

⁷ XII 545.

II.—SOME GERMANIC ETYMOLOGIES.¹

It is now nearly thirty years since I studied Sanskrit and Comparative Philology at the University of Leipzig, with Curtius, Leskien, Osthoff, Hübschmann, and Brugmann. In my book on the Sumerian family laws, which I published in 1879,² I remarked that the principles of comparative philology were practically unknown to Semitic grammarians, and that Assyriologists, therefore, would have to get their linguistic equipment from Indo-European scholars; but, with the exception of Professor Brockelmann,³ of Königsberg, hardly any Semitic scholar has followed my advice. My investigation of Semitic phonetics, which I published, in 1889, in the first part of the Johns Hopkins Contributions to Assyriology and Comparative Semitic Grammar,⁴ is to the majority of Semitic scholars still a book with seven seals, although one of the greatest authorities in the domain of phonetics, E. Sievers stated on p. 14 of his *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig, 1901) that he agreed on all essential points with my views concerning the Semitic consonants (JAOS 22, 14).

I have recently devoted special attention to etymological research, and as it is very important for work in this interesting field to have as many semasiological parallels as possible, I have always studied the etymologies of the Indo-European equivalents of the Semitic terms which I investigated, especially

¹ Presented at the meeting of the American Oriental Society, April 18, 1906.

² *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 11, 4; cf. *ibid.* the remarks at the end of note 3 on p. 20 and ZDMG 34, 763.

³ See my note on the first edition (Berlin, 1899) of his Syriac grammar (second edition, 1905) JAOS 22, 14; cf. Brockelmann's papers ZDMG 57, 628; 58, 518; 59, 629.

⁴ *Die semitischen Sprachlaute und ihre Umschrift in Beiträge zur Assyriologie und vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, edited by Friedrich Delitzsch and Paul Haupt, vol. 1, part 1 (Leipzig, 1889), pp. 249-267. This article was written in 1887; see *l. c.*, p. 266, n. 48.

the explanations given in the latest edition (1905) of Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*,¹ Hermann Menge's new *Griechisch-Deutsches Schulwörterbuch mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Etymologie* (Berlin, 1903), and the etymological remarks in Dr. Murray's *New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, issued by the Clarendon Press.

In one of his last prophecies, the preaching of repentance during Sennacherib's invasion (701 B. C.) the prophet Isaiah says of Jerusalem:²

Thy silver is changed to dross,
Thy wine is *mahûl*.

Mahûl is generally derived from the post-Biblical verb *mahâl*, to circumcise.³ *Circumcised* wine is supposed to mean *vinum castratum*, or wine mixed with water. This is the translation given in the Authorized Version as well as in the Revised Version. In French, *coupage*, German *Verschneiden* (i. e., castration) means to 'doctor' wine by blending or adding alcohol (as in the case of sherry and port). But castration and circumcision are two very different operations, and circumcision

¹ Cf. my remarks on *heifer*, German *Färse* in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie* etc., vol. 1, p. 114. I still believe that Germ. *Farre*, fem. *Färse*, Eng. *heifer*, Greek *πάρτις*, may be Semitic loanwords (Heb. *par*, young bull, fem. *pārdh* = *pārdt*, Assy. *pārtu*). The suggestion that the Anglo-Saxon *heahfore* might mean 'highfarer,' i. e. 'high-goer,' or 'high-stepper,' is not satisfactory. I believe with the Oxford Dictionary that the applicability of such a name is not apparent. See also Muss-Arnolt, *Semitic and other Glosses to Kluge's Wörterbuch* (reprinted from *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 5, No. 8), Baltimore, 1890, p. 24. *Ibid.* p. 46 Muss-Arnolt mentions my combination of *lecken* in the Biblical phrase *wider den Stachel lecken* or *löcken* (Acts 9, 5) with *to lick* = to beat, Germ. *schlagen*. Greek *πρὸς κέντρον λακτίζειν*, Lat. *contra stimulum calcare*. To *lick* = Germ. *schlagen* may be connected with *leg*; a leg of veal is called in Southern Germany a *Kalbsschlegel*, from *schlagen*; in Northern Germany: *Kalbskeule*; cf. German *keilen* = *schlagen*; *Keule* = club, cudgel. I have given some new Germanic etymologies in my address on Purim, published in vol. 25, of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (New York, 1906).

² See the translation of Isaiah in the Polychrome Bible (New York, 1898), p. 44.

³ See note 11 to my paper on the etymology of Heb. *mohél*, circumciser, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, July, 1906.

in the Old Testament symbolizes purification and improvement, but not adulteration and deterioration. Heb. *mahûl* in Isaiah 1, 22 means, not *circumcised*, but *dreggish* or *ropy*. The term *ropy* means *stringy*, i. e. capable of being drawn into threads. The Century Dictionary says: Wine is called ropy when it shows a milky or flaky sediment and an oily appearance when poured out. In Addison's version of Vergil's Georgics we find:

They hoard up glue, whose clinging drops,
Like pitch or bird-lime, hang in stringy ropes.

The Isaianic lines should be rendered:

How is she become a harlot,
The faithful city!¹
O Zion, full of justice,
Where right abode,
Thy silver is changed to dross,
Thy wine is ropy.²

Heb. *mahûl*, ropy, stringy, dreggish is connected with the Arabic verb *mâhala*,³ to drag, i. e. to move or proceed slowly, to hang behind with a retarding tendency, to lag in the rear. The derivative *muhl* means especially *dregs of olives* or *marc*, also the liquid running from a putrescent corpse, and the corresponding Talmudic term *môhal* has the same meaning. The connection between slowness, tardiness, sluggishness, laziness, idleness, foulness, filthiness, rottenness, is known to any charity agent; and the German *faul* means not only rotten, but also sluggish, lazy, idle. At German schools you can hear the emphatic compounds *stinkend faul* or even *mistmadenfaul*, literally as lazy as maggots in dung.

The Isaianic term *mahûl*, ropy, stringy, dreggish,⁴ led me to investigate the etymology of our English word *dregs* and its

¹ Each line has 3 + 2 beats; cf. my translation of Psalm 23 (in English, German, and Assyrian) in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 21 (April, 1905), pp. 137-8.

² In German, ropy wine is called *fadig*, *schleimig*, *ölig*, *weich*, *säh*, *lang*.

³ See my paper on the Heb. stem *nahâl*, to rest, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 22 (April, 1906), p. 206, n. 36.

⁴ Latin *vinum faculentum*.

synonym, *marc*. *Marc* means the refuse which remains after the pressure of grapes or other fruit. The word is borrowed from the French. The refuse of pressed grapes is called in French: *marc de raisins*, and *marc de café* means coffee-grounds. In the Oxford Dictionary *marc* is derived from *marcher* which means, not only to march, but also to tread, to crush. Originally the juice was squeezed from the grapes by treading. In the opening lines of the Song of Vengeance at the beginning of c. 63 of the Book of Isaiah we read:¹

Who advances, all spattered with crimson,
than vintagers' garments more ruddy? ^a
^βAlone, have I trodden a wine-vat,^γ
and spilled on the ground all the juices;

and this is explained by the glosses:

- (a) Say, wherefore is red thine apparel,
and thy garments like one treading grapes?
(β) Triumphantly, lo, I am speaking,
after a notable victory.
Of peoples not one was there with me.
In anger I trod them,
and stamped them in fury.²
Their juices besprinkled my garments,
defiled was all my apparel.

Similarly the etymological equivalent of our verb *to walk* means in German *to full cloth*, just as we find in early English: *walk-mill* (= German *Walkmühle*) for fulling-mill. The Heb. verb *kibbés*, to wash garments, means in Assyrian: to tread, and our verb *to full* corresponds to the French *fouler*, to tread; *fouler des raisins* means to press grapes; *foulerie* is used both for wine-press and fulling-mill. The German word for wine-

¹ See my restoration of the text in No. 163 (June, 1903) of the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, p. 49.

² Apart from this line, which has 2 + 2 beats, the hemistichs have 3 beats. Lines with 2 + 2 beats are combined with double-hemistichs of 3 + 3 beats in David's Dirge on Saul and Jonathan, also in the Song of Lamech. See my metrical translation (in English, German, and Assyrian) of David's elegy in No. 163 (June, 1903) of the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, pp. 55-6, and my translation of the Song of Lamech in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 20 (April, 1904), p. 164.

press, *Kelter*, is the Latin *calcatura*, treading, and in Switzerland a wine-press is called *Trott* (from *treten*, to tread).

In the Century Dictionary *marc* is derived from Latin *emarcus* (or its Celtic original) which is said to mean 'a kind of wine of middling quality.' This Gallic word *emarcus*, however, probably means 'made from marc.' The French name for this wine, which is made by steeping in water the skins, etc., of pressed grapes, is *piquette*, German *Tresterwein*¹ or *Lauer*. This term may be combined with the verb *lauern* = to lie in wait, to lurk, to lurch, just as *lee* = French *lie* is connected with *to lie* = to settle, so that *lees* means originally 'sediment.' Weak coffee made by boiling coffee-grounds is called in certain parts of Germany *Lurke*. The old English name for inferior cider made from the refuse of apples, after the juice has been pressed out for cider, is *ciderkin*.

Marc cannot be derived either from the Gallic *emarcus* or from the French *marcher*; but it may be identical with the German *Mark*, English *marrow*. Marrow means not only the medullary matter of bone, but also the pulp of fruit. The original Germanic form was **mazga* = Avestan *mazga*; the *r* is due to rhotacism. Marrow is generally combined with Latin *mergere*, to dip, English *to merge*; but this explanation is not satisfactory. German *Mark*, marrow, however, is connected with the German adjective *ausgemergelt*,² which means 'enervated.' The original meaning is 'marrowless, sapless.' An *ausgemergelter Wüstling* is a man who has drained the cup to the bottom or to the dregs, sounded the depths of vice, sapping his strength. I do not believe that this *sap* is identical with the military term *sap* = to undermine; it may be a privative verb meaning 'to deprive of the sap,' just as we say to stone raisins, to sprout potatoes, to skin an animal, to brain an enemy, to worm a dog, etc. The English etymological equivalent of *ausgemergelt* is *marcid* = shrunk, wasted away.

¹ Greek οἶνος τρυγηφάνιος. The English equivalent of German *Trester* or *Treber* (or *Träber*) is *draff*. *Trester* stands for *trefstir*. For the connections of *draff* with *dregs* (Greek τρύβες) see below, p. 159, l. 13.

² *Mergel* is the German equivalent of *marl*, French *marne*. *Marl* is used as manure. Kluge explains *Mergel* as *fette Düngererde*. Cf. also French *merde* = Lat. *merda*.

Marcid means originally 'squeezed out like marc or dregs,' just as we say 'pumped out' for breathless, exhausted. The Latin prototype for *marc* is not the Gallic word *emarcus*, but *amurca*, or *amurga* = Greek ἀμόργη, denoting the watery part which runs out when olives are pressed. Ἀμόργη comes from ἀμέργειν, to squeeze, which is probably akin to ἀμέλγειν, to milk. In English we have the adjective *amurcous* = full of dregs or lees, dreggish, feculent. As a rule, ἀμέργω means 'to pluck, to pick'; it is connected with ὁμόργνυμι, to wipe off. In our colloquial phrase *to milk a friend's purse*, we use *milk* in the sense of draining the contents, exhausting, just as *dragged* may mean 'physically exhausted.' Drag, dreg, drain, drail, draggle, drabble, drab, draff, drawl, dredge are all connected with *draw*.¹

Dregs denotes the sediment of liquors, the more solid particles which settle at the bottom of a solution or other liquid; it means especially a thick or turbid sediment and is synonymous with feces, excrement, refuse, rubbish. Now it is clear in the first place that *dreg* is identical with the good old German word *Dreck* which means dirt, mire, mud, dung; in a more emphatic compound (*Sch . . ssdreck*) it is used especially of feces, excrements. *Schneppendreck* is the term for the contents of the intestines of snipes, which are served on toast as a special delicacy. Our *dreggy* = foul, muddy, feculent, corresponds in some respects exactly to the German *dreckig*. Hall Caine uses *draggy* instead of *dreggy*: the roads were soft and *draggy*.² This shows the connection between *dreg* and *drag*. The verb *to dredge* = to remove mud and silt from the bottom of a harbor or river, etc., is merely a byform of *drag*. *Dredge* means also a mixture of oats and barley sown together, but formerly it was synonymous with *meslin* (or *maslin*) = a mixture of rye and wheat.³ To dredge may be a privative

¹ To draw is not cognate with Latin *trahere*, but with German *tragen*, to carry. To carry may mean to lead or draw mentally. For the German adjective *träge* = sluggish, originally 'dragging,' cf. *dreggy* = foul = German *faul* = *träge*; see below, p. 160, n. 2.

² Quoted in the Oxford Dictionary. *Draggy* is not given in the Century Dictionary.

³ For the connection of *dredge* and *dregs* we may bear in mind that we speak of the *dregs of society*, German *die Hefe des Volks*, French

verb, so that to dredge a harbor would be originally to 'undreg' it, to remove the dregs. Also *draggle*, *bedraggle*, and *drabble* are connected with *drag* and *dreg*. *Draggle* is the frequentative of *drag*, just as *drawl* is a modern frequentative of *draw*. To drawl means 'to drag out the words.' *Draggled* or *bedraggled* means *befouled* (German *beschmutzt*, *verdreckt*, for which the common people use *beschissen*).¹ *Draggle* is generally supposed to mean to make a thing dirty by allowing it to *drag* through mire, etc., but it may be derived from *drag* = *dreg*. In the same way a *drag-net* is not simply a net to be dragged, but a net to be drawn *on the bottom* of a river, etc., i. e. a ground-net. I stated that to *drain* was connected with *draw* and *drag*, and I referred to our phrase to drain the cup to the bottom or to the dregs (French, *boire le calice jusqu'à la lie*). *Drag* is a secondary form of *draw*. To *drag* means to draw or pull something which is heavy or resists motion; the intransitive verb means to move heavily or slowly, to advance or progress slowly. *Dreg* may mean originally a thick or turbid sediment which is viscous and glutinous, sticky, clammy.² *Drag* refers to the ground or bottom of a thing. The German word *zähe*, which is used in some connections for viscous, French *visqueux*, is not connected with the verb *ziehen*, to draw, to drag, but is the regular etymological equivalent of our *tough*. We speak of tough clay, tough phlegm or mucus. Phlegmatic means originally full of phlegm.

After this 'phlegmatic' discussion I will proceed to the etymology of a more sanguine subject, viz. the etymology of the

la lie du peuple, la lie du genre humain (= *le rebut de l'humanité*). We use the term *canaille* for rabble, and *canaille* means also a mixture of the coarser particles of flour and fine bran. Cf. also *drabble* (= *draggle*) for rabble and the Shakespearean *drab* = prostitute. For the etymologie of French *lie* = lees, see above, p. 158, l. 10.

¹This word *besch..ssen* means also to cheat and throws some light on the etymology of the English verb which is generally regarded as a clipped form of *escheat*. Cf. Old French *eschiter* = *chier* and the phrase *il a chié dans mon panier*, etc. = he has cheated me. Our term *shyster* seems to be a corruption of Ger. *Sch...sskerl*.

²Cf. the remarks on the German adjective *träge* (= sluggish) which is used also of the water of a sluggish stream. Cf. above, p. 159, n. 1. Instead of *träge* you can say *schleichend*, and the verb *schleichen* seems to be connected with *slow*.

word *bride*. I have just published in the April number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages* an article on the Hebrew stem *nahál*, to rest, which is mistranslated in all our Hebrew dictionaries. *Nahál* is akin to *mahál*, from which the Isaianic *mahûl*, dreggish, ropy, is derived. Both go back to the same root. In a note to this paper I have illustrated the development of Semitic triconsonantal stems from biconsonantal roots by discussing some of the words derived from the root *kl*, to hold, from which e. g. *kiliáh*, kidney; *kil'áim*, two, and *kalláh*, bride, are derived.¹ *Kiliáh*, kidney, means originally 'held,' i. e. enclosed, capsulated, referring to the capsules of the kidneys and the fat in which they are imbedded. *Kil'áim*, two, denotes originally a brace, i. e. what is held together, coupled, a couple, a pair.

As to *kalláh*, bride, some connect it with Aramaic *kalîlâ*, crown, explaining it to mean 'she who is crowned.'² Friedrich Delitzsch in his *Prolegomena* (Leipzig, 1886) believed, it denoted originally the closed bridal chamber, while W. Robertson Smith, in his book *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia* (Cambridge, 1885), p. 136, stated that the etymological sense was that of *covering*. I believe, however, that *kalláh*, bride, means 'held,' i. e. engaged, pledged, betrothed, affianced.

The words for *bride* mean, both in Semitic and Indo-European, not only a woman recently married, but also a woman about to be married, and the term *bride* is used also for daughter-in-law. This is the meaning of the word in Gothic; also the French *bru*, which is a Germanic loanword, means daughter-in-law, and Greek *νύμφη* is used both for bride and daughter-in-law (Matt. 10, 35; Luke 12, 53),³ just as Heb.

¹ See my paper *Semitic Verbs derived from Particles* in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, July, 1906, p. 207.

² Not only the bride wore a bridal crown, but also the bridegroom; cf. my translation of Cant. 3, 11 in my *Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), pp. 4, 25 = *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 18, pp. 194, 215.

³ Cf. for this passage ll. 20-28 of the second tablet of the cuneiform incantations known as the *šurpu* series, translated in H. Zimmern's *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der babylonischen Religion* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 3; see also my paper *Babylonian Elements in the Levitic Ritual* in vol. 19 of the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1900), pp. 55-81, and

kalláh. In German the term *Braut* is never used after the wedding day; while in English, *bride* means a woman recently married. This was the meaning of the word (*brût*) in Middle High German.¹

The Oxford Dictionary states that *bride* is a woman just about to be married, or very recently married. The term is particularly applied on the day of the marriage and during the honeymoon, but it is frequently used from the proclamation of the banns, or other public announcement of the coming marriage. This is the German usage; as soon as a girl is engaged she is called in Germany a bride, while the term *Braut* is never used after the wedding. In the parliamentary debate on the allowance of Queen Victoria's fourth son, Prince Leopold, Duke of Albany, Gladstone was criticized for speaking of the Duke's *fiancée*, Princess Helen of Waldeck, as the *bride*. The Grand Old Man replied, he believed that colloquially a lady when engaged was often called a *bride*. This was met with *Hear! hear!* from some, and *No! no!* from others. The Oxford Dictionary adds: Probably *bride-elect* would have satisfied the critics. The posthumous son of Prince Leopold and Princess Helen is now Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha.

Gladstone's use of *bride* in the sense of a lady engaged is more German than English; but, as we shall see presently, it is the original meaning. The Oxford Dictionary states that the radical sense of the word is uncertain, adding that it may possibly be connected with the verb *to brew*, cook, make broth, a duty of a daughter-in-law in the primitive family. This explanation is just as fanciful as the old etymology of *daughter* which was supposed to mean *milker*. I stated in a note to my paper on Moses' Song of Triumph² that Miriam might possibly mean *milker*. This etymology is at least as certain as the explanations that Miriam (or Mary) means *rebellious* or *fat*,

chap. xvi of Jastrow's *Religion Babylonians und Assyriens*, vol. 1 (Giessen, 1905), especially p. 325.

¹ Our word *spouse* (French *époux*, fem. *épouse*) means originally not husband or wife, but *promised*, *betrothed* (Latin *sponsus*, *sponsa*). The French *épousée* means bride on the day of the marriage (*la nouvelle mariée*) or recently married.

² *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, vol. 20 (April, 1904), p. 152, n. *.

although Orientals consider a fat woman especially beautiful.¹ Mephistopheles says in the second part of Goethe's *Faust* (ll. 7782-3 of the edition of the Bibliographische Institut):

*Recht quammig, quabbig,² das bezahlen
Mit hohem Preis Orientalen.*

Instead of explaining *bride* to mean *broth-maker*, we might interpret it as the *bread-maker*, our word *bread* being connected with the verb *to brew*. Heb. *bashál*, to ripen, means both to cook and to bake. But the word *cake* is not akin to *cook*. *Bride*, however, has no connection with *brew*.

Some are inclined to combine *bride* with *Frûtis*, an Italian name of *Venus mater*, and *Frutis* is supposed to be identical with *Aphrodite*. The name *Aphrodite*, however, is probably a Greek adaptation of the Semitic *Astarte*, with *ph* for *th*,³ and *Frutis*, if it be Indo-European, may be connected with our *fruit*. Otfried Müller believed it to be an Etruscan name. Etruscan was no Indo-European language. Professor V. Thomsen in his *Remarques sur la parenté de la langue étrusque* (Copenhagen, 1899) thinks there may be some affinity between Etruscan and the eastern group of the northern Caucasian

¹ *Fair as the moon* is one of the most common comparisons in Arabic. A maiden is often addressed *O Moon* or *O Full moon*; see my *Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 25, below. According to Oriental ideas a *moon-face*, i. e. a full, round face is one of the principal features of beauty in a woman. It is not a doubtful compliment as the German term *Vollmondsgesicht*. Tennyson calls Maud *the moon-faced darling of all*.

² That is, flaccid, flabby, blubbery; French *mollasse*.

³ Cf. my *Beiträge zur assyrischen Lautlehre* in the *Nachrichten* of the Royal Society of Göttingen (Apr. 25, 1883), p. 97, n. 3; Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1884), p. 76, below, and the references given in the 14th edition of Gesenius' Hebrew lexicon (Leipzig, 1905), p. 572^a. See also Muss-Arnolt, *Semitic Words in Greek and Latin* (Transactions of the American Philological Association, vol. 23, 1892), p. 55, below; p. 75, n. 12. Heb. *Āšōreth* instead of *Āšdōreth* = *Āšdōrt* is a *Qerē* like *Jehovah* for *Jahvéh*; see the notes on the translation of the Psalms in the Polychrome Bible (New York, 1898), p. 163, l. 41. The Jews substituted *bōšēth* = *αἰσχύνη* for the name of the heathen goddess. This explains *Baal* with the feminine article; *ḥ Baal* was read *ḥ αἰσχύνη*; see Critical Notes on Kings (in my *Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Hebrew*), p. 294, l. 28.

languages (Lesghian, etc.). Several scholars are of the opinion that there is some connection between the language of the second species of the trilingual Akhæmenian cuneiform inscriptions, known as Susian or Elamite, and the southern Caucasian language known as Georgian (or Grusian or Gruzinian).¹ In a paper published two years ago, in the Proceedings of the Royal Society of Bohemia, Karl Kramář advanced the theory that there was an affinity between Georgian and the language of the pre-Semitic aborigines of Babylonia, Sumerian. I pointed out some connection between Sumerian haruspicy and Etruscan ceremonies in my paper on Babylonian Elements in the Levitic Ritual.²

In this connection I should like to raise an Assyriological protest against Scheftelowitz's fanciful theories concerning cuneiform idioms. On p. 411 of the fifth volume of the Johns Hopkins Contributions to Assyriology, which has just been completed, Dr. Hüsing, who has devoted special attention to the Susian or Elamite language, remarks that Friedrich Delitzsch has authorized him to state that Delitzsch had advised the editors of Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* not to publish Scheftelowitz's article. Dr. Hüsing adds, we can say of every single page of Scheftelowitz's paper, it is a pity that it has been printed. Nearly two-thirds of all the forms and words given by Scheftelowitz are wrong.

There is no certain trace of the word *bride* outside the Teutonic group. I believe that *bride* must be connected with *bridle*. After a girl is engaged, she is no longer free, at least in Europe, but *bridled*, restrained, pledged. In Germany a girl, when engaged, often says: *Ich bin gebunden, ich bin nicht mehr frei*; and a man, who desires to be released of an engagement, says: *Gieb mich frei*. In early English we find *bride* in the sense of *bridle*, e. g. he took him by the *bride*. *Bride* is the common word for *bridle* in French, and *brider quelqu'un par un contrat*, lit. to bridle, i. e. restrain, bind someone by a contract, means to make a contract with some one,

¹ Cf. my *Prolegomena to an Assyrian Grammar* in vol. 13 of the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, p. ccxlix, § 2, b (Proceedings at Baltimore, October, 1887). See also Peiser's *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, vol. 7, 407; 8, 53. 184. 550.

² See above, p. 161, n. 3.

put him under legal obligation. Sheridan says in *The School for Scandal*: Charles is *contracted* by vows and honor to your ladyship. To contract means especially to bind one's self by promise of marriage. *Contract* means *affianced*. Shakespeare (*Richard III.*, 3, 7) says: First was he *contract* to Lady Lucy.

Bride or *bridle* is probably connected with *braid*. We use *braid* of a plaited band of hair, whether twined around the head or hanging behind; also for a narrow textile *band* or tape used as trimming for garments, etc. The primitive meaning of to *braid* is to *draw*, to pull. The German equivalent of *braid* is *Zopf*, and the denominative verb *zupfen* means to pull, while the German words for bridle, *Zügel* or *Zaum*, are connected with the verb *ziehen*, to pull. To *upbraid* (i. e. *castigare verbis*) corresponds to the German *züchtigen*. The German verb *aufziehen* means to rally, to banter, to taunt. To taunt means not only to tease, but also to upbraid with insulting words.

So *bride* means 'no longer free, but bridled, restrained,' bound in the bonds of matrimony. In the good old times the bride was *bridled* after the wedding, the husband took the reins, and the bride obeyed them.¹ This may be old-fashioned, but that is no argument against the correctness of my etymology.

PAUL HAUPT.

¹ In the form of the solemnization of matrimony, given in the Book of Common Prayer, which is still used in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the bride promises to love, cherish, and to obey her husband. Modern brides, however, not infrequently object to the verb *obey*.

III.—THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE ANTONINES.

A comparison of the status of the municipalities in the Roman empire at the close of the second century of our era with what it was, when the Spanish cities received their constitutions from the Flavian emperors, reveals changes in their constitutional rights and restrictions on the management of their local affairs, that vitally affected the administrative independence which they had enjoyed for nearly two centuries.

In the arrangements that followed the Social War, the Italian cities were allowed full freedom in the administration of their affairs, except for the limitations placed on the jurisdiction of the municipal courts. As to the provincial cities, Rome, especially in the later conquests of the republic, exhibited the statesman's wisdom in securing the good-will and finally the Romanization of conquered communities by according to them the greatest possible freedom in their local administration that was consistent with her sovereignty.

Though frequently treated with great harshness during the Civil War, yet, with rare exceptions, their affairs continued to be managed by their own magistrates, and the advent of the empire and the mild measures of the Augustan constitution made secure for them the freedom which under the republic was constantly in jeopardy.

The personal interest of Augustus was confined chiefly to strengthening the Italian cities. The population of many he increased by adding colonies from Rome, and Italian cities were especially favored by him in the grant of better political rights as the *ius Latium*. In the provinces Augustus established new colonies, but with few exceptions he refused¹ to promote the status of the older communities.

From Augustus to Vespasian but one emperor, Claudius, took any interest in promoting the welfare of the municipalities. His

¹ O. Hirschfeld, *Zur Geschichte des Lateinischen Rechts*, p. 9 f. Herzog, *Gallia Narbonensis*, p. 101.

activity¹ in granting the *ius coloniae*, *ius Latium* and the *ciuitas* is attested not only by many inscriptions and Pliny's survey of the empire, but also by the sneer of his satirist² Seneca, which serves to establish the policy that the latter as prime minister recommended to Nero.

The dominant policy, therefore, of the first century of the empire tended to extend the advantages and the freedom inherent in the better rights accorded the cities. The constitutions granted by the Flavians gave them a free hand in local administration.

For various reasons, however, the Antonine emperors had found it necessary to lay hands upon the municipalities and either to limit their powers or to exercise a control over their administration. There are reasons to believe that Vespasian also realized into what wretched condition municipal administration had fallen and took some measures to correct it. The discussion will return to these measures further on. The policy and activity of the Antonines, beginning with Trajan, points to a conviction that the cities were threatened with ruin and only stringent measures could save them.

The fact that the most graphic accounts of these morbid conditions are to be found in the letters of Pliny, prefect of Bithynia, has, perhaps, tended to call undue attention to the cities of the eastern provinces and to establish the conviction that they were in a much worse condition than the western cities. They were larger and wealthier than the younger cities of the west, hence offered greater opportunities for corruption, but the appointment of imperial curators³ by Trajan in Italian and western communities indicates that the emperor ordered searching investigations in other provinces than Bithynia,⁴ which were spared the exposure of a literary governor.

Our main sources of information regarding the condition of the cities in this period are 1) the rescripts of the emperors, 2) the inscriptions and 3) the correspondence of Trajan and Pliny.

¹ O. Hirschfeld, l. c.

² De Morte Claudii 3: Ego (Clotho) mehercules, inquit, pusillum temporis adicere illi uolebam, dum hos pauculos, qui supersunt, ciuitate donaret.

³ C. I. L. X 6006.

⁴ Herzog, Gal. Narb. p. 252; Idem, Röm. Staatsverfassung II, I p. 348. Nicht alle Stadthalter werden so viel gefragt und damit so viele Entscheidungen erhalten haben, aber nach Abzug der besonderen Verhältnisse darf man dieses Beispiel doch wohl als eines unter vielen annehmen.

The orations of the contemporary Dio Chrysostom, especially the 46th, *De Tumultu*, deal considerably with city economy, but the line of demarcation between rhetoric and sober fact is too difficult to draw to render his statements of any real value for the purposes of this investigation.

From these sources it will be seen that the interests of the cities suffered from dishonest and neglectful officials in nearly every branch of the administration. A statement of the various sources of a Roman municipality's revenues and their relative importance, together with its expenses, would help to make clear the conditions that prevailed. Such a statement cannot be given here and the reader is referred to the yet inadequate expositions to be found elsewhere¹.

Furthermore the effects of the abuses will be more fully understood if we take into account the fact that only by a careful administration of the limited funds at their command could the expenses of most of the cities be kept within their revenues. Adequate revenues were not, at the period under consideration, and never had been, provided to meet the demands of the annual budget. Cicero, while pro-consul of Cilicia, had found it necessary to frame with great care that part of his edict which dealt with the cities in order to reduce their expenses². The Augustan constitution which so utterly failed to effect a satisfactory organization of the finances of the empire³ could not be expected to bring relief to the municipalities and the disinclination of his successors to make changes in the constitution as left by the first emperor perpetuated these defects. This inadequate provision for the financial needs of the cities was met, to a large extent, by reducing to a minimum the need of funds⁴ through the system of *munera*⁵, which was so elaborately developed during the empire.

¹ Revenues: Humbert, *Essai sur les finances et la comptabilité publique chez les Romains* (Paris 1887) Vol. I, p. 402 ff, II, p. 60 ff; Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung* (Leipzig, 1900), p. 2 ff; Karlowa, *Röm. Rechtsgeschichte*, I, p. 898. Expenditures: Liebenam, l. c. p. 68 ff.

² Cic. Ep. ad Fam. III 8, 4—*diligentissime scriptum caput est, quod pertinet ad minuendos sumptus civitatum*; cf. Ad Att. 21, 10 ff; Ad Fam. XV 6, 2.

³ Schiller, *Geschichte der Kaiserzeit* (1883), I, II, p. 752; Herzog, *Geschichte u. System d. röm. Verfassung* II, I, p. 217.

⁴ Friedländer: *Städtewesen in Italien unter d. röm. Kaisern*, *Deutsche Rundschau*, Bnd. XIX, p. 214.

⁵ See Kuhn, *Bürg- u. Städtische Verf.* I, p. 38, for the best exposition of the *munera*.

The only important source of revenue added by Augustus came from the founding of the priesthood of *Augustales*. Whatever the purpose of the organization may have been, it was placed in the hands of the *decuriones* and by that order was used to relieve the financial distress of the city. They were elected by the *decuriones*,¹ as were the magistrates soon after the reign of Tiberius, and when no candidates presented themselves, suitable persons of sufficient wealth were compelled² to accept election just as was the case again with magistrates. The *Augustalis* paid into the city treasury a *summa honoraria* amounting to about 10,000 sesterces,³ which was the average amount required of a *duovir*. In certain semi-legislative acts, as the voting of honorary monuments, the *Augustales* sometimes acted with the *decuriones*,⁴ sometimes in conjunction with a popular assembly, but often enough without the latter to show that the dignity of the priesthood was considered equal to that of the *decuriones*. This priesthood thus restored to the wealthy freedmen an avenue to the distinction which with a curtailment of political rights had been lost and also secured from them heavy contributions for public purposes. This source of revenues fell chiefly to the Italian communities where, by order of Caesar, when dictator, freedmen were excluded from municipal magistracies. In the provinces they were more extensively organized in Spain, especially after Vespasian granted the *ius Latium* to the Spanish cities, a constitution that also excluded freedmen from the magistracies.⁵

Considering further the heavily increased taxes levied by Vespasian,⁶ burdens which the municipalities had to share, it can be seen that there were a number of causes that conspired to bring the cities to the verge of ruin. To correct the abuses and restore the provincial cities, claimed the attention of all the Antonines, especially Nerva, Trajan and Hadrian, whose reforms, however, were extended and made more effective by their successors, Pius and Marcus Aurelius.

¹ C. I. L. X 112 ob honorem Aug. quem—a senatu—accipere meruit.

² C. I. L. X 114 l. 32 ff. hoc autem nomine relevati impendiis, facilius pro-silituri hi, qui ad munus Augustalitatis compellentur.

³ C. I. L. X 4792, cf. Liebenam, l. c. p. 57.

⁴ C. I. L. IX. 4760—decreuit ordo decurionum et Augustalium et plebs uni-versa. Cf. XI 3013.

⁵ C. I. L. II 1944 VI Augustalis in municipio Suelitano D. D. primus et perpetuus omnibus honoribus, quos libertini gerere potuerunt, honoratus. Cf. Momm., Stadtrechte, p. 416.

⁶ Suet. Vit. Vesp. 16; Cassius Dio 66, 2, 8, and 14; Zonaras II, 17.

Two measures of Nerva were intended to aid the municipal finances. The first was the establishment of the well-known alimentation funds to restore agriculture in Italy, as well as to aid needy children. There can be little doubt that the cities were considerably benefited by the short-lived success of this institution although on just what terms they received the funds we do not know. Since, however, at a later period, when the possessor of lands that were obligated to the alimentation fund could no longer pay the interest, he assigned in favor of the imperial fisco (*fisco locum facere*),¹ it is probable that the cities received the funds in trust and not as a gift.

The other constitution granted to the cities the right to receive legacies. In this connection it should be remembered that the legacy was an essential part of the income. Although there was no law, at the time under consideration, requiring wealthy citizens to leave a portion of their property for public purposes, yet the practice had become so common as to make the legacy a reliable source of income.² The inscriptions show that very frequently the funds for an important festival, a temple or a public building, were accumulated through a long period of years either from an aggregation of gifts or from the principal and accrued interest of a single bequest. The value, apparently, of Nerva's law must have rested in the increased assurance that the bequest would be properly applied and the wish of the testator respected, for surely before Nerva's time the municipalities could and did receive public bequests. Without the corporate right, however, to receive it, the bequest was made, not to the *res publica*, but to the inhabitants severally³ and its use, presumably, was subject to their will expressed by ballot or, perhaps more frequently and less judiciously, by a popular demonstration in the theater.

Inasmuch as the legislation of Nerva and Hadrian had restricted the use of bequests to the purposes stated in the will,⁴ important aid was afforded the cities by rescripts of Antoninus Pius and

¹ Codex Ius., XI 33, 2, 2.

² Ulp., 24, 28: *Ciuitatibus omnibus, quae sub imperio populi Romani sunt, legari potest idque a Nerva introductum, postea a senatu, auctore Hadriano, diligentius constitutum est.* Ibid., 22, 5, *fideicommissa hereditas municipibus restitui potest, de qua hoc senatus consultum prospectum est.*

³ Dig. Iust., 34, 5, 20, *cui (collegio) autem non coire licet, si legetur, non ualebit nisi singulis legetur.* Cf. C. I. L. V, 5203, 5878.

⁴ Dig. Iust., 50, 8, 4: *legatam municipio pecuniam in aliam rem quam defunctus uoluit, conuertere citra principis auctoritatem non licet.*

M. Aurelius, of which the former allowed them, on receiving permission from the emperor, to disregard the wish of a testator who would have a superfluous building erected and apply the bequest to the maintenance of existing buildings,¹ the latter to refuse a gift made on conditions detrimental to their interests.²

It was from Trajan that the actual administration of the cities received the most attention. Chief among the abuses that prevailed, not only in Bithynia but in other parts of the empire, was the failure to deal effectively with the public debtor.³

The accounts consisted chiefly of (1) the gifts (*summa honoraria*) promised by magistrates on entering office, (2) the loans of municipal money, including permanent funds, and (3) the legacies.

The inscriptions afford considerable evidence that the discharge of a promise made by a magistrate on entering office was not infrequently long delayed and it seemed worthy of record if it was paid during his term of office.⁴ Particularly serious was the frequent failure to complete a structure that had been promised and begun. Many inscriptions refer to incomplete buildings and even in the cases where it is not specifically stated, we are probably warranted in concluding that a would-be public benefactor has not fulfilled his promise. Such failures were sufficiently general to cause Trajan to issue a constitution making it binding, not only on the person who made the promise but upon his heir as well, to complete the work. This salutary law was made more specific by Antoninus Pius, who required a direct heir to forfeit ten per cent, a devisee not related to the testator (*heres extraneus*) to forfeit twenty per cent, of the inheritance in case of failure to complete the promised building.⁶

¹ Dig. Iust., 50, 10, 7, (Callistratus) Pecuniam quae in opera noua legata est, potius in tutelam eorum operum quae sunt, conuertendam, quam ad inchoandum opus erogandam diuus Pius rescripsit.

² Dig. Iust., 50, 12, 11: (Papirius Iustus) Item rescripserunt (Antoninus et Verus) condiciones donationibus adpositas, quae in rem publicam fiunt, ita demum ratas esse, si utilitatis publicae interest.

³ Plin. Ep. X 47.

⁴ C. I. L. VIII 8300, *anno suo* posuit dedicauitque. IX 1156: intra lustrum honoris eius, repraesentata pecunia, strauit. Cf. 2350, 1143. VIII, 17258.

⁵ Dig. Iust., 50, 12, 14. Si quis sui alieniue honoris causa opus facturum se in aliqua ciuitate promiserit, ad perficiendum tam ipse quam heres eius ex constitutione diui Traiani obligatus est.

⁶ Dig. Iust., 50, 12, 14, sed si quis ob honorem opus facturum ciuitate aliqua promiserit atque inchoauerit et priusquam perficeret, decesserit: heres eius extraneus quidem necesse habet aut perficere id aut partem quintam patrimonii

Caracalla placed the promise of a *summa honoraria*¹ on the same basis with the agreement to construct a public work, and Ulpian states that a rescript of the same emperor converted it into an interest bearing debt,² when payment was delayed.

In dealing with the borrower of municipal funds the city administration was both weak and corrupt. It would be an error however to suppose that these loans (*ex kalendario*) were made solely from surplus treasury funds. They doubtless embraced numerous foundations for charitable and other purposes of which the inscriptions record so many³ instances. The causes of such a failure to protect the community's interests can be seen in rescripts forbidding the lending of public funds without security or to persons already in debt to the city. It gave occasion for one of the drastic measures of Trajan, the institution of the *cura kalendarii*.

Kuebbler has attempted to show that the institution of the alimentation fund was the occasion for appointing the *Curator kalendarii* ostensibly to take charge of the administration of that fund.⁴ He not only fails, however, to prove his proposition, but the rescript of Severus (Cod. Ius. IV 31, 3), shows clearly that the *pecunia alimentaria* was entirely distinct from the accounts of the *kalendarium*. The rescript is worth quoting in full, because, in the first place, it shows plainly that the funds committed to the *curator kalendarii* were wholly independent of the alimentation funds and incidentally catalogues all the different heads under which a city kept its accounts: — In ea, quae reipublicae te debere fateris, compensari ea, quae ab eadem tibi debentur, is, cuius de ea re notio est, iubebit, si neque ex kalendario, neque ex uectigalibus, neque ex frumenti uel olei publici pecunia, neque tributorum,

relicti sibi ab eo, qui id opus facere instituerat, si ita mallet, ciuitati, in qua id opus fieri coeptum est, dare: is autem, qui ex numero liberorum est, si heres exstitit, non quintae partis sed decimae concedendae necessitate adficitur et haec diuus Antoninus constituit.

¹ Dig. Iust. 50, 12, 6, 1. (Macrinus). Si quis pecuniam ob honorem promiserit coepitque soluere, *eum debere quasi coepto opere*, imperator noster Antoninus rescripsit.

² Dig. 50, 12, 1: (Ulpian) si pollicitus quis fuerit rei publicae opus se facturum uel pecuniam daturum, in usuras non conueniatur; sed si moram coeperit facere, usurae accedunt, ut imperator noster cum diuo patre rescripserunt.

³ Friedlaender, l. c.

⁴ Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung fuer Rechtsgeschichte, roman. Abt. XIII, p. 156 ff.

neque alimentorum, neque eius, quae statutis sumptibus seruit neque fideicommissi ciuitatis debitor sis.

Liebenam's statement that this official was charged with the administration of the city's outstanding accounts¹ is vague and capable of various interpretations, and leaves the exact nature of his relationship to the city a matter of doubt.

In Italy the *curator kalendarii* was appointed by the emperor in many cases at least, and probably in all instances, as Kuebbler suggests. The appointment in the provinces was made by the governor as the direct representative of the emperor. Certain very specific qualifications were required, the nature of which is not anywhere stated, but they can with probability be inferred. The governor was authorized to make the appointment only after careful investigation (*ex inquisitione*) and since, on the one hand, no bond was required,² whereas, on the other hand, his private fortune secured the community against all loss incurred during his curatorship,³ the investigation must have concerned his financial standing and not his administrative abilities. This then, was the chief feature of his relationship to the municipality, namely his responsibility to protect with his own fortune the city's loans.

In defense, therefore, of his private fortune, he had to ascertain the financial standing of all borrowers of public money, not only of those to whom loans were made during his own term of office, but of those whose names he received from his predecessor. Thus, his administrative functions were secondary and his relation to the city was similar to that of the *exactores*, the *decuriones* who were held responsible for all shrinkage in the taxes due the state.

In order to procure the prompt payment of bequests, a rescript of Antoninus Pius required trustees, who unduly delayed to carry out the wishes of the testator, to pay interest at a higher than the current rate.³ A bequest was payable on the date stipulated in the will, and if no date was stated, the governor of the province fixed a date after which interest should be due, at six per cent if the bequest was not paid over to the city within six months, at a lower rate if it was paid sooner.⁴ A rescript of M. Aurelius made

¹ L. c. p. 482 'der Verwalter des staedtischen Schuldbuches'.

² Dig. 50, 8, 9, 7: a curatore kalendarii cautionem exigere non debere, cum a praeside ex inquisitione eligatur.

³ Dig. 50, 8, 9, 9: Item rescripserunt (Antoninus et Verus) nominum, quae deteriora facta sunt tempore curatoris (kalend.) periculum ad ipsum pertinere.

⁴ Dig. 50, 10, 5: Si legatum uel fideicommissum fuerit ad opus relictum, usurae quae et quando incipiant deberi rescripto diui Pii ita continentur: si quidem

the magistrates who failed to perform their duty in exacting payment of a legacy, their heirs, or their bondsmen liable for the losses thus incurred.¹

The method adopted in the case of bequests was likewise employed in dealing with a worse class of offenders, the magistrates and other officials who unlawfully retained public money in their private possession. Cicero speaks of this crime among the Greek magistrates, from whom he recovered public money that had been retained for several years.² M. Aurelius made funds thus retained bear interest.³

In like manner a curator placed in charge of a public work was required to pay interest on the excess funds that remained in his possession.⁴

The attitude of the state toward the municipalities is clearly shown by the fact that, whereas a debtor to the imperial fiscus was eligible to the highly esteemed honor of representing his home city before the provincial governor or the emperor, the citizen who was in debt to the city was not allowed to undertake such an embassy, (Dig. 50, 7, 4, 1: rescript of Pius).

In discussing the vices whereby the municipal revenues had suffered, mention has already been made of a law of Trajan which assured the community that a building once begun should be completed. How general were such expensive fiascos at building as Pliny reports from Bithynia cannot now be determined, but

dies non sit ab his, qui statuas uel imagines ponendas legaverunt, praefinitus, a praeside provinciae tempus statuendum est, et nisi posuerint heredes, usuras leviores intra sex menses, si minus, semisses usuras rei publicae pendant. Si uero dies datus est, pecuniam deponant intra diem aut—semisses protinus pendant.

¹ Dig. Iust. 50, 1, 38, 2: Imp. Antoninus et Verus rescripserunt; ad magistratus officium pertinere exactionem pecuniae legatorum et si cessauerint, ipsos uel heredes conueniri aut, si soluendo non sint, fideiussores eorum qui pro his cauerunt.

² Cic. ad Att., VI 2, 5: Mira erant in ciuitatibus ipsorum furta Graecorum, quae magistratus sui fecerant. Quaesiui ipse de iis, qui annis decem proximis magistratum gesserant. Aperte fatebantur. Itaque sine ulla ignominia suis umeris pecunias populis rettulerunt.

³ Dig. Just. 50, 8, 9, 10: Imp. Antoninus et Verus rescripserunt eum qui pecuniam publicam magistratus sui tempore et post non pauco tempore detinuerat, usuras etiam praestare debere, nisi si quid adlegare possit, qua ex causa tardius intulisset.

⁴ Dig., 50, 8, 9: Imp. Antoninus et Verus rescrip. pecuniae quae apud curatores remansit, usuras exigendas.

they were probably numerous and fully justified the emperor in forbidding the construction of a new building at public expense without his permission. Thus he returned to the policy of the early republic when the Roman censors had charge of the building projects in the Italian cities. There is, however, no evidence of the narrow policy of the earlier times but the restriction appears simply as a salutary measure to protect the interests of the cities themselves. The spirit and purpose of the law is apparent in the rescript granting to the people of Sinope the privilege to build an aqueduct. The permission was granted on the condition that they should be able to complete it. (Pliny X 91, also Ep. 24.)

The law was accepted and reiterated in the constitutions of later emperors, as Macer, a jurist of the time of Alexander Severus, states.¹ It was a restriction which the earlier emperors had not placed upon the cities except in the case of walls of fortification.²

In the alienation of the city's rights in the ground, both the *ager* and the ground within the pomerium (*loca publica*), was an abuse that had from time to time caused the state to interfere in municipal affairs. These rights insured an important source of revenues which the cities received from those who tilled ground within the territorium.³

The city had no right to alienate either *ager* or *loca publica*, yet in fact such unconstitutional acts seem to have been not infrequent.

Vespasian was the first of the emperors who took active measures against such illegal possessors and reclaimed public land both in Rome⁴ and in the provinces.⁵ Ulpian, in discussing the duties of the *curator reipublicae*, states that the titles should

¹ Dig., 50, 10, 3, 1: Publico uero sumptu opus nouum sine principis auctoritate fieri non licere constitutionibus declaratur.

² Dig. Just., 50, 10, 6.

³ Plin. H. N. 18, 3. Etiam nunc in tabulis censoriis *pascua* dicuntur omnia ex quibus populus reditus habet, quia diu hoc solum vectigal fuerat. Hyginus p. 202, Ed. of Lachmann, haec (compascua) beneficio coloniae habent in forma COMPASCUA PUBLICA IULIENSIIUM inscribi debent: nam et vectigal quamvis exiguum praestant.

⁴ C. I. L. VI 933. Imp. Caesar Uespasian. Aug. . . . locum uinae publicae occupatum a priuatis per collegium pontificum restituit.

⁵ Hyginus, De Cond. Agr., p. 122, ed. Lach., lapides (in prouincia Cyrenensium) uero inscripti nomine diui Uespasiani sub clausula tali,

OCCVPATI A PRIVATIS FINES:
P. R. RESTITVIT.

be investigated and public property restored,¹ by the provincial governor, if the city had no curator. The plain inference is that the condition was very general.

Thus the *curator rei publicae* was given the procuratorship of public ground, which carried with it the authority to dispossess illegal occupants, even though they might have acquired the land by *bona fide* purchase. In the latter case the evicted possessor had recourse upon the person from whom he had bought the land.²

The property thus held in private possession had in most cases, if not all, been unconstitutionally alienated by the *decuriones* themselves, a procedure which Ulpian states was of common occurrence.³ The reason for such an act on the part of the *decuriones* is probably not far to seek. The *lex coloniae Genitivae* forbids in the strongest terms the granting of public property of any description (*pecunia publica aut pro ea quid*) in consideration of a gift or other benefaction to the community.⁴ The grant of nearly 40,000 denarii to Piso by the *decuriones* of Amasia, was, to all appearance, made in consideration of public benefactions. (Plin. X 90.)

Land thus alienated by the highest municipal authority could be restored only by the state.

It is improbable that the same conditions prevailed in all cities and that the same measures and methods were necessary in all. The procuratorship of public ground which was vested in the provincial governor or the *curator rei publicae* in cities to which such an official was appointed, was vested in other cases, apparently, in a *curator operum publicorum*.

¹ Dig. 50, 10, 5, 1: Fines publicos a priuatis detineri non oportet. Curabit, igitur, praeses prouinciae, si qui publici sunt, a priuatis separare.

² Dig. 50, 8, 11, 2: Item rescripserunt (Aurelius et Verus) agros rei publicae retrahere curatorem ciuitatis debere, licet a bona fide emptoribus possidentur cum possint ad auctores suos recurrere.

³ Dig. Iust. 50, 9, 4, 1: Ambitiosa decreta decurionum rescindi debent; proinde, ut solent, siue aliquem debitorem dimiserint siue largiti sint siue decreuerint de publico alicui uel praedia uel aedes, uel certam quantitatem praestari, nihil ualebit huiusmodi decretum.

⁴ Lex. Col. Gen. ch. CXXXIV: Ne quis Iuir aedili(s) praefectus c(oloniae) G(enetiuae) quicunque erit, post h(anc) l(egem) ad decuriones c(oloniae) G(enetiuae) referto neue decuriones consulito neue d. d. facito neue d. e. r. in tabulas publicas referto neue referri iubeto neue quis decurio, cum e(a) r(es) a(getur), in decurionibus sententiam dicito neue d. d. scribito neue in tabulas publicas referto neue referendum curato, quo cui pecunia publica A(ut pro ea) quid honoris habendi, causa munerisue d(andi) pollicendi proue statua ponenda detur donetur

It has been suggested that this *cura* was instituted in order to relieve the regular magistrates of the ever increasing burden of overseeing the building operations of the cities or to superintend the construction of buildings donated by the emperor.¹ Against such a theory it may be said, in the first place, that we have no evidence of so great activity in the building operations of the municipalities that the *duoviri* and *aediles* could not oversee them. The theory seems to be influenced by the conditions in a modern city. The revenues of a Roman city, including gifts, hardly permitted extensive annual building projects.

As to the theory that the *curator operum publicorum*, when appointed by the emperor, had charge of the construction of buildings that were gifts from the emperor, it is certainly an error to confuse the curator that the emperor or the city appointed to take charge of a particular work (quos efficiendo operi praestituit, Dig. 50, 10, 2, 1) with the *cura operum publicorum*, a permanent office at Rome and is found in some provincial cities. Thus broadly interpreted, the imperial curator in charge of the construction of an aqueduct, of a temple (Trac. IV 56) or of a bath (c. X 1419), has been regarded as the *curator operum publ.* of the inscriptions.

There is but little evidence that the *cur. oper. publ.* had charge of building operations at all. From the time the Roman censors allowed the cities to conduct their own building work, it was in charge of the magistrates, nor did they lose the authority when a *curator rei publicae* was appointed over them.² It is doubtful whether the latter had the authority to take charge of a new construction unless the decuriones entrusted it to him, just as the *duumviri* or *aediles* might be commissioned by the same body. Numerous inscriptions connect the *cur. rei publ.* with building projects, but they are chiefly on monuments in honor of the emperor³ or pertain to restorations.⁴

The evidence of the inscriptions is all, perhaps, in harmony with the statement of Paulus that it was the duty of

¹ Liebenam, l. c. 385. Daremberg-Saglio, article, *Curatores*, p. 1623.

² Numerous inscriptions of the second and third centuries prove this statement. See Liebenam l. c., p. 383.

³ C. I. L., VIII 2345, 2480, 2660, XI, 3091.

⁴ C. I. L., III 568, X 1199, 4860, 5200, VIII 2388, 4221, 5178, 5335, 5341, 8480, 11184, 12285, 16400, Or. 6579. IX, 2238.

the *Cur. rei publ.* to keep the buildings in the city in a state of repair.¹

A consideration of the functions of the *curator operum publicorum* in Rome will, perhaps, help to indicate the character of the similar *cura* in the municipal administration. Their chief functions, as stated by Mommsen, (St. R. II, p. 1002), were first the assignment of public ground for buildings and monuments that served a public purpose; secondly, to remove obstructions from public property or impose a rental (*solarium*) for the use of such property. The last two functions were plainly stated by Ulpian in his commentary on the edict (Dig. 43, 8, 2, 17), and the first is as fully attested by the inscriptions.

Turning now to the municipality, it is possible, perhaps, to determine the nature of the *cura*. The few inscriptions in which the *Cur. oper. publ.* is mentioned are nearly all of sepulchral character and throw but little light upon the nature and functions of the office. The following inscription, however, which was found at Puteoli, must be considered: (C. I. L., X 1791):

ded IC. XI. K. IUL. IMP. COM.
mo DO. AUG. III. ET. ANTISTIO.
bur RO. COS. LOC. ADSIG. PER
ar SENIUM. MARCELLUM. CUR.
5 ope R. PUB. CUR. VALERIO.
fel ICE. ET AVILLIO. PU
de NTE

The left side of the stone is broken away and leaves the reading in some doubt. Prof. Mommsen's *ut uidetur* in the index (p. 1149) recognizes the uncertainty of reading *Cur. rei publicae*. In considering this inscription the following facts should be observed:

1. The inscription is not symmetrical, hence no indentation is required at the beginning of line 5 to correspond with an apparent indentation at the end of the line.
2. The treatment of the last line reveals a determination to keep the left margin of the document full.
3. A comparison with lines 1, 3, and 6 shows that there was room enough on the portion of the stone which has been broken away, to read *oper(um)*.

¹ Dig., 39, 2, 46; ad curatoris r. p. officium spectat, ut dirutae domus a dominis extruantur, domum sumptu publico exstructam si dominus ad tempus pecuniam impensam cum usuris restituere noluerit, iure eam res publica distrahit.

So far, therefore, as the outward form of the inscription is concerned, there can hardly be any valid objection to reading *cur. operum publicorum*.

In the notes, however, to C. I. L. X 1814 Prof. Mommsen is of the opinion that Valerius Felix and Avillius Pudens of the inscription in question are duovirs by whom the space was assigned on the authority of the *curator rei publicae*. But the preposition *ab* is lacking and comparison with an inscription found in Rome (C. I. L. VI 1119) in which the same formula is used in combination with the one usually employed for the *curator operum publicorum*—*locus assignatus ab L. Allio Basso et Commodo Orfitiano cur. oper. publ. C. V. cur. M. Caecilio Athenaeo, M. Valerio Midia, L. Allio Amphitale*—makes it sufficiently certain that Valerius and Avillius had charge of the construction only. The preposition *per*, however, recognizes a higher authority, which was probably the *curator rei publicae*.

If this is the correct reading, the inscription indicates, first that the *cur. oper. publ.* here mentioned exercised the same authority over the *loca publica* as the curator of same title did in the administration of the city of Rome; secondly, that he had nothing to do with the placing of the monument, which was done by the duovirs or the aediles.¹ The fuller title—*curator operum locorumque publicorum*—and the statement of Festus that *loca publica* implied also *sarta tecta*² undoubtedly indicate the functions of this curator, namely, the control of public ground and the repair of public buildings.³

His authority, therefore, to recover public ground illegally held in private possession is not only implied, but to him, when appointed by the emperor, as well as to the *praeses*, apply the words of Ulpian, in substance identical with his statement on the same subject in his comments on the edict pertaining to Rome,

¹ C. I. L. XIV 2590

locus datu(s)

a Cestio Rubo curat. operi
aedil. L. Avelli Metilliani et
Vibi Rubi

L. 2, operi(s), Mommsen.

Praestat fortasse *oper(um)*, Dessau.

² Festus, XVII, s. v. *sarte*: *opera publica, quae locantur, ut integra praestantur, sarta tecta uocantur.*

³ C. I. L. XI 3258: *cur. pec. publ. et operum publicorum quibus ex fide reffectis ob merita eius . . .*

that in case of ground which was occupied by public buildings, it must be either reclaimed or subjected to rental.¹

The first known instance of an imperial *curator operum publicorum* appointed for a municipality, is found at Nola (CIL. X 1266) and the appointment was made by Vespasian, the emperor who, as shown above, took active measures to recover the public land that was held in private possession. In Suedius Clemens also, whose mission to Pompeii was to restore to the city the *loca publica* which had been seized for private use, one is tempted to recognize another imperial *curator operum publicorum*.²

The conditions at Pompeii have been attributed to the confusion arising from the partial destruction of the city by the earthquake in the year 63.³ The theory is very improbable, as the boundaries in a city of brick and stone are not so readily disturbed.

The suggestion of Nissen, that Vespasian restored to the city the land that Nero had seized and bestowed on favorites,⁴ is certainly more probable, but in view of the apparent frequency with which municipalities suffered through neglectful magistrates or an unconstitutional measure of the *decuriones*, a specific historic event is not required to explain the situation at Pompeii.

The election posters (C. I. L. IV 768, 1032, 1059) which recommend for the duovirate Epidius Sabinus, who had defended the interests of the city against the illegal holders, reveal the importance of the case. Pompeii could hardly have been the only city in Italy in which the abuse existed and it is not improbable that the *cur. oper. publ.* in other cities,⁵ appointed by the emperor in one case (C. IX 1160), and doubtless also in others, had the same duties to perform as Suedius Clemens.

Beginning with the reign of Hadrian, notices become frequent that wealthy citizens resorted to every means to escape the *munera*

¹ Dig. Ius. 50, 10, 5, 1: Si qua loca publica vel aedificia in usu priuatorum inuenerit (praeses prouinciae) aestimare utrumne uindicanda in publicum sint aut uectigal eis satius sit imponere et id, quod utilius rei publicae intellexerit, sequi.

² C. I. L. X 1018: ex auctoritate Imp. Caesaris Vespasiani Aug. loca publica a priuatis possessa, T. Suedius Clemens tribunus, causis cognitis et mensuris factis, rei publicae Pompeianorum restituit.

³ Julian, Les Transformations politiques de l'Italie sous les Empereurs Romains, p. 106 f.

⁴ Nissen, Pomp. Studien p. 479.

⁵ C. I. L. III 285, IX 3923, X 1266, 3759, 3910, XI 1340, 3091.

on which the city administration so largely depended. The rescripts of Hadrian and his successors (Dig. 50, 6, ff.) have regard, in general, to wealthy citizens who sought through registration in a college, as the *naucularii*, whose members were exempt from other *munera*, to escape the obligations of property and person. Although in some instances the laws specifically favored the municipality, yet it is too difficult to draw the line between state and city interests to warrant further discussion of the subject here.

In the efforts to reform the municipal administration and restore the cities, the most important agent employed was the *curator rei publicae*, first appointed by Trajan, who exercised some oversight over every branch of the city's affairs. The conditions already described show the necessity for such an official and indicate his functions.

The article by Liebenam in *Philologus* for 1897 renders further discussion of that curatorship unnecessary here, although the treatment there given lacks the historical perspective which the sources allow. The authority of the *curator rei publicae*, which at first was little more than advisory, was gradually increased by the absorption of other functions such as the *cura operum publicorum* (C. I. L. XI 3091) and the *cura kalendarii* (C. I. L. VIII 8396) until he virtually had full control of the city's affairs.

If we consider the efforts of the individual emperors to ameliorate the condition of the municipality, we find that the methods varied considerably. The short reign of Nerva did little more than to institute the policy and set an example. The policy of Trajan seems to have been founded on the conviction that by a proper administration of their affairs the cities could be restored to a healthy condition. Disregarding, therefore, their rights and sentiments (Plin. Ep. X 48), he ordered his prefects to make investigations and, where necessity demanded, subjected the entire administration to the oversight of a special official, with powers substantially equal to those of the provincial governor. He made no concessions intended to relieve their accumulated obligations to the state.

Evidently accepting the reforms of Trajan in the field of the administration of the cities, Hadrian's policy was rather one of relief and assistance.¹ The relief, however, afforded by the

¹ Zonaras, II, 12. Spartianus, Vit. Had. 7, 9.

emperor's remission of fifteen years' back taxes, was but temporary, for the large amount of taxes remitted by Marcus Aurelius extended back over sixteen years of the reign of Hadrian.¹

Throughout the entire period and in most of the measures, there are traces of a policy to favor the Italian communities more than the provinces. Trajan's reluctance to grant the *ciuitas Alexandrina*² suggests that Pliny's statement, (Paneg. 37, 3, *noui (ciues) seu per Latium in ciuitatem seu beneficio principis uenissent*) must be interpreted as referring to Italy chiefly, if not alone. Therein he returned to the policy of Augustus, who refused the *ius Latium* to provincial cities. Furthermore Hadrian's numerous gifts to the cities were made chiefly to Italian communities, if a conclusion can be drawn from the meager evidence of the inscriptions.³

The evident purpose of such a policy was to insure the Romanization of the provinces by strengthening Italy and thereby securing for Roman culture that predominance in the empire, which, through the decimation of the Roman nobility and the promotion of the powerful provincial families (Tac. Ann., III 55), had begun to weaken.

In the provinces Hadrian made comparatively few gifts to cities. In Spain he restored the theater at Emerita—CIL. II 478. The aqueduct which he began to build for Athens (Vit. Hadr. 20), was completed by Antoninus Pius (C. I. L. III 549). It is probable, moreover, that the gifts made to the provincial cities were not made from private funds (*ex pecunia sua*), but from local revenues by imperial decree as in the case of the aqueduct at Alexandria. See Philos. Vit. Soph., p. 56, ed. Kayser: πεντακοσίων πόλεων φόρον ἐς μῆας πόλεως δαπανᾶσθαι κρήνην. See also C. I. L. II 1640, 1641, ex beneficio eius (Traiani) pecunia publica; III 14120, ex sacris pecuniis deae Dictynnae. In a similar way Antoninus Pius favored the cities of Italy. See Sievers, Studien zur Geschichte der roemischen Kaiser, p. 197, Anm. 20.

It is hardly necessary to point out the tendency toward a centralization of power, which the policy of restricting the adminis-

¹ Cassius Dio, 71, 32, 2: ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἑξ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα χωρὶς τῶν ἑκκαίδεκα τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ.

² Pliny, Ep. X 7.

³ C. I. L. V 2152, 4315, 4316; IX 5294, 5681; X 1640-1, 3832, 4574, 5649, XIV 98, 95, 2798; XI 6115.

trative independence of the provincial municipalities so clearly indicates and so strongly accelerated. Inaugurated as a means of correcting abuses and checking corrupt practices in the municipal administration, a large corps of officials while enforcing the numerous corrective measures of imperial origin kept the affairs of even remote communities constantly under the eye of the imperial government at Rome.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

T. LOUIS COMPARETTE.

IV.—LITERARY SOURCES IN CICERO'S BRUTUS AND THE TECHNIQUE OF CITATION IN DIALOGUE.

The Ciceronian dialogue, reminiscent of the origins of this literary form in a metropolis of talkers, and at a time before the general diffusion of books, still aims to maintain the fiction that spoken discourse is the normal medium for the communication and transmission of thought. In large measure therefore, though by no means consistently, it ignores books and avoids allusion to them, referring a knowledge of the statements or opinions of others to communication with the speakers of the dialogue by word of mouth, either directly or through intermediaries. Upon this fiction is based the whole framework of composition, as when dialogues like the *De oratore* or the *De re publica*, which are, in fact, learned treatises drawn from the technical literature of rhetoric or philosophy, are represented as having been reported to the author by some one who heard the actual discussion which the dialogue reproduces. It should be, and in Cicero's best work is, an essential part of the dialogue setting, to indicate clearly the channels of such transmission. Thus Rutilius Rufus in the *De re publica* is the connecting link between the Scipionic group and Cicero, while Cotta and Scaevola play a similar rôle for the *De oratore* and the Laelius respectively. Instances of frank invention like the Cato Major, with no suggestion of a connecting intermediary between the original conversation and the author, lose an element of dramatic persuasiveness which renders them less artistic.

Again, within the dialogue itself references to historical events and to literature of an earlier time are made usually by appeal not to books or to historical records, but to the evidence of report, either vaguely and in general terms—*accepimus, video, audiui*, etc., or with specific designation of some medium of oral communication. Thus historical illustrations, which may be derived either from current tradition or from written records, are introduced on the evidence of an intermediary between the event and the speaker. So, for instance, the story of the Tuscan haruspices (in *De nat. deor.* II 11) is introduced by Balbus with the words: *tum Gracchus, ut e patre audiebam*, bridging thus the gap between

the event (163 B. C.) and the dramatic date of the dialogue (ca. 75). The same device is used a little further on with reference to the famous portent of the double sun of the year 129, *ut a patre audivi* (ib. 14). In such cases we shall not, of course, name the father of Balbus (nor, with Mayor, the father of Cicero), as the real source of Cicero's information. The author was concerned only to make a plausible connection of oral tradition between a time antecedent to the lives of his interlocutors and the time of the dialogue setting. It is merely a more specific form of such a statement as we find in Brutus 104: *atque hoc memoria patrum teste dicimus*.

Ideas and events of still greater remoteness are sometimes reported as having been transmitted through a series of intermediate personages, in order to preserve the fiction of oral communication. Some noteworthy examples are afforded by the Cato Major. In 39 Cato introduces 'an ancient discourse of Archytas of Tarentum'. The method of its transmission from a conversation of Archytas with C. Pontius, the Samnite,¹ to one Nearchus, Cato's host at Tarentum, is carefully set forth; for the gap between Archytas and Nearchus Cicero contents himself with the words: *se a maioribus natu accepisse dicebat*. No one will doubt, I think, that Cicero had the matter from a literary source, whether Archytas, or the otherwise unknown Nearchus, or Aristoxenus, as Zeller suggests. The element of 'tradition' which the commentators have attributed to the passage, belongs to the technique of the dialogue and not to the words of Archytas. Another example of similar character is found in 43 with somewhat more circumstantial indication of the sources of Cato's acquaintance with the philosophy of Epicurus: *saepe audivi e maioribus natu, qui se porro pueros a senibus audisse dicebant*, etc.

Again, the Pythagorean doctrine of immortality is introduced in 78 with the words *audiebam Pythagoran . . . numquam dubitasse*, etc., and it is followed by a reference to the Platonic view, which carefully avoids the suggestion that Cato had, of his own initiative, read the Phaedo: *demonstrabantur mihi . . . quae Socrates . . . disseruisset*.²

¹ He is introduced to indicate the time of Archytas by a Roman synchronism: *patre eius, a quo Caudino proelio Sp. Postumius T. Veturius consules superati sunt* (= 321 B. C.)

² In all of these examples, in addition to the characteristic feature of dialogue composition which they illustrate, a special reason for emphasizing so strongly the traditional source of the information in question lay perhaps in the per-

These illustrations will suffice to make clear in a general way the principle of dialogue art from which we started. That is, the author in making acknowledgment of indebtedness to earlier sources will place his interlocutors in some relation of personal communication with the authorities themselves from whom he draws, for the sake of maintaining consistently the fiction of oral transmission. By the device of one or more intermediaries, which we have noticed in the *Cato Major*, it is possible to refer to sources more remote than those contemporary with the interlocutors of the dialogue. But the method is obviously cumbersome and the difficulty of establishing a plausible relationship grows with each remove from the time of the dialogue-scene. Except for special reasons therefore, such as we found in the character of *Cato*, it is not much used. Accordingly, the great majority of allusions to well-known authorities of the remoter past are introduced directly in the present tense—*ait (dicit) Aristoteles*, etc.—without any effort to indicate channels of oral transmission. The effort to maintain the semblance of personal communication is thus confined for the most part to such sources as fall contemporary (in some degree at least) with the lives of the interlocutors. Anachronisms are apparently studiously avoided.

This usage or technique I shall now illustrate in greater detail from the dialogues of Cicero, grouping them into these classes: (I) dialogues, the dramatic setting of which lies wholly in the past; (II) dialogues, contemporary with the time of the writer, in which he himself participates. In this class I shall differentiate again between expressions of obligation (a) attributed to other interlocutors, and (b) those which the author himself, as a speaker in the dialogue, makes.

(I). Dialogues of the first type have already been illustrated by the *Cato Major*. Some further observations may be added from the *De oratore*. In Book I Crassus Antonius and Scaevola review the scholastic controversies concerning the scope and nature of rhetoric, the justification of its claims to be regarded as an art or science, and its relation to philosophy and statesmanship. No one, of course, can doubt that the matter thus presented was derived by Cicero from the books of Greek theorists, and that further-

sonality of *Cato*. Cicero doubtless felt that it would be inappropriate that *Cato* should reveal any acquaintance with Greek philosophy except such as might have been gained in conversation or intercourse with others. But see the same device in *Lael.* 88.

more, if it was known at all to the characters of his dialogue, it was acquired by them from the same sources. But consistently with the demands of dialogue composition set forth above, Cicero represents each one of his interlocutors as having knowledge of such discussions from conversations with Greek philosophers and rhetoricians themselves. So Crassus (in I 45) alludes to the question and its discussion by the Greeks, and explains his acquaintance with their views: *audivi enim summos homines, cum quaestor ex Macedonia venissem Athenas*, etc. There are then named a number of philosophers, Charmadas, Clitomachus, Aeschines, and Metrodorus of the Academy, Mnesarchus the pupil of Panaetius, and Diodorus the pupil of Critolaus the Peripatetic. It is significant that nearly all of these, even in the paltry record which has survived from this time, appear elsewhere as contributors to this prolific controversy¹. Antonius in turn contributes his share to the discussion from similar reminiscences of conversations with practically the same group of philosophers named by Crassus: (*Athenis*) *cotidie mecum haberem homines doctissimos*, eos fere ipsos qui abs te modo sunt nominati (I 82). Scaevola also, on his way to Asia as praetor, had heard at Rhodes the rhetorical side of the controversy defended against the attacks of the philosophers by Apollonius (Molon), who ridiculed the views of Panaetius, which Scaevola presented, and made jest of philosophy in general: *invisit ille quidem, ut solebat, philosophiam*, etc. (I 75). The allusion here contained in *ut solebat* is probably to the work of Apollonius *κατὰ φιλοσόφων*.² In none of these cases are we justified, it would seem to me, in using Cicero's statements concerning the association of his interlocutors with the Greek writers named as material for the history of the times, or for the biographies of the respective persons, though this has generally been done. The recognized technique of dialogue composition

¹ The arguments of Clitomachus and Charmadas are touched upon by Sextus Adv. rhet. 20, where *οἱ περὶ τὸν Κριτόλαον* are also cited. The peripatetic definition of rhetoric in Nic. Soph. (Spg. III 451) probably goes back to the Diodorus of our passage, and it contains a suggestion of one of the mooted points in controversy. Mnesarchus was a writer of vigorous polemical character (Acad. post. fr. 1), and the clear and sharp formulation of the Stoic position which is presented on his authority in I 83 (*sicut iste ipse Mnesarchus*) was doubtless drawn from writings of his, which Cicero attests (in Fin. I 6) that he had read.

² See Susemihl, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* II, p. 492 n. 137.

impelled him to put his characters in some relation of personal contact with the sources from which he himself drew. For the assumption or the free invention of such relationships, the foreign travel of his characters, in their various capacities as provincial administrators, afforded a plausible starting-point.¹

In conclusion I would note two minor examples from the *De oratore*. In III 225 the story of C. Gracchus' employment of a slave, whose duty it was by the use of a pipe to correct and guide his master's voice in public harangues, is introduced by the words: *quod potes audire Catule ex Licino*, cliente tuo, litterato homine. Catulus replies: *audivi* mehercule et saepe sum admiratus, etc. In this case there is no doubt that some treatise of the grammarian Porcius Licinus is the source of the curious story, the ramifications of which in subsequent literature have been so interestingly traced by Büttner.² Again in *De or.* I 72, the editors of Lucilius have not hesitated to accept a fragment attested by the words: *sed ut solebat C. Lucilius saepe dicere*, etc.

(II). Turning now to contemporary dialogues let us first note some examples in which (a) interlocutors other than Cicero make such references to the sources from which their material is derived. A good example is afforded by the speech of Lucullus in the *Academica Priora*, in which the general position of Antiochus in criticism of Philo and the New Academy is set forth. The circumstances of Lucullus' familiarity with the opinions of Antiochus are carefully explained, and his knowledge of their bearing upon the opposing ideas of Philo: *cum Alexandriae proquaestore, inquit, essem, fuit Antiochus mecum, et erat iam antea Alexandriae familiaris Antiochi Heraclitus Tyrius . . . cum quo Antiochum saepe disputantem audiebam* (II 12). The whole setting, so fully described in the passage from which I have made a single extract, is of course a fiction, as has long been recognized, and the matter which Lucullus professes to report from oral discussions was in fact derived directly by Cicero from a work of

¹ Crassus was quaestor in Asia, but Cicero says (probably inaccurately): *cum quaestor ex Macedonia venissem Athenas*. Cf. Wilkins ad I 45. Antonius on his way to Cilicia as proconsul was detained several days at Athens by unpropitious weather (*propter navigandi difficultatem*), which gave him opportunity for the conversations he describes. Scaevola was praetor in Asia in 121, but it seems unlikely that Apollonius (Molon) had as yet taken up his residence at Rhodes. Cf. Susemihl II, p. 490. Cicero is here, perhaps, guilty of a slight anachronism, if, as seems likely, Apollonius Molon is meant.

² Porcius Licinus, p. 81 ff.

Antiochus.¹ So inappropriate was the whole situation assumed as the source of the dialogue, as Cicero himself confesses,² that in the revision of the work it was completely changed at the suggestion of Atticus, and the work was dedicated to Varro, who is made the chief interlocutor. But Varro in turn, like Lucullus of the earlier edition, but more appropriately in view of his character and studies, presents the views of Antiochus as a reminiscence of the actual discourses which he and Cicero had heard in their youth: *quid est enim quod malim quam ex Antiocho iam pridem audita recordari* (I 14). That this portion too does not depend on Varro's, (or Cicero's) own recollection of Antiochus' lectures, but is transcribed from a book or books by the master, is a conclusion which no one now will be likely to dispute (Reid, p. 57).

Other examples could be cited showing with what freedom Cicero handled his characters in order to establish a plausible relationship of personal intercourse between them and the sources which he used, and it would, perhaps, reward investigation to sift and examine them all.³ To what extent the dramatic setting of the dialogues has passed into subsequent historical record—whether in ancient or modern times—should be investigated, as when Plutarch in his life of Cato uses the episode of the conversation of Cato with Nearchus as attested fact, or again in his life of Lucullus attributes to him all that Cicero, with self-confessed fiction, had said to give plausibility to the setting of the *Academica Priora*.⁴

Up to this point we have seen how Cicero with the freedom of a dramatist attributes the results of his own reading to the

¹ Cf. Reid, Acad., p. 52: "No one can read the speech of Lucullus without perceiving that Cicero wrote it with a Greek work lying open before him, from which almost every sentence has been directly transferred. This book was in all probability the Sosus [of Antiochus]". Hirzel, Untersuchungen III p. 251: "Dass für den Inhalt desselben die Erinnerung an mündliche Vorträge des Philosophen die Quelle gewesen sei, ist eine Möglichkeit die vom Standpunkt der heutigen Quellenforschung überhaupt und der ciceronischen insbesondere keine Beachtung mehr verdient".

² See the references in Reid's Int., p. 33 n. 9, and esp. ad Att. XIII 16, 1 *παρὰ τὸ πρέπον* videbatur, quod erat hominibus nota, non illa quidem ἀπαίδευσία, sed in eis rebus ἀτριψία.

³ So for example, A. Goethe, in the introduction to his edition of the *De nat. deor.*, p. 13, remarks that Cicero apparently identifies himself with Cotta in such a manner as to make it doubtful whether his statements concerning Cotta's acquaintance with Zeno, the Epicurean, have any historical foundation.

⁴ Cf. Plutarch, C. M. 2, 4; Lucullus 1 and 42. See also Reid, Int. to Acad., p. 33, n. 8.

characters of his dialogue, placing them so far as possible in a relation of personal communication with the writers from whom he draws, and representing their discourse as a reminiscence of such communication. We have noted further that he makes apparently no distinction in this respect between those dialogues which, like the *De oratore* or the *Cato Major*, lie wholly in the past and those which are placed in his own time. But thus far we have only considered his treatment of speakers other than himself.

(b). It remains to consider whether the same interpretation is to be attached to utterances which Cicero, the author, attributes to himself as an interlocutor; that is, whether we are at liberty in the same manner to assume a *literary source* for utterances which Cicero himself, in the rôle of a character in the dialogue drama, professes to have *heard*. It will, I think, seem probable a priori, in view of the quite consistent characteristic of dialogue composition which has been noted, that the same rule should apply to all the speakers of the dialogue; that Cicero, therefore, in his own rôle will attribute to personal intercourse (wherever chronological or historical considerations do not forbid) material which in fact he may have derived from literary sources.

For this situation, however, there do not seem to be any such conspicuous or considerable examples as we have noticed in the rôles of Lucullus and Varro in the *Academica*. This is due in part to the fact that Cicero often assigns the more positive parts, which would depend more naturally upon particular sources, to others, reserving for himself the rôle of critic and arbiter. In the *Academica* to be sure there is a suggestion of the source from which the sceptical arguments, with which Cicero replies to Varro, are drawn. But it does not entirely serve the purpose of our argument, since in referring to Philo, the teacher of Antiochus, it designates his books as well as the discourses to which Cicero had listened: *quamquam Philo . . . negat in libris, quod coram etiam ex ipso audiebamus*, etc.¹ Such examples serve to show the natural interpretation of other passages where personal communication is the only channel of transmission suggested, but they have no coercive force.

¹ Cf. Tusc. V 22 *ista mihi et cum Antiocho saepe et cum Aristo nuper, cum Athenis imperator apud eum deversarer, dissensio fuit: . . . dicebantur haec, quae scripsit etiam Antiochus locis pluribus.*

In many cases a literary source may seem to be the most natural one to assume, and yet, from the nature of our record, the material for its demonstration may be lacking. So in *De legg.* I 53 Atticus tells a story, which he professes to have heard from Phaedrus the Epicurean (*audire ex Phaedro meo memini*), of one Gellius who as proconsul came to Athens, and with amusing *lourderie* (or waggishness, perhaps) collected the philosophers and urged them with earnest insistence to put an end at length to their disputes. The reply of Cicero: *iocularis istud, Pomponi, et a multis saepe derisum*, suggests that the matter had figured in literature before, presumably in a work of Phaedrus, and probably elsewhere. With more certainty that we are dealing entirely with literary sources may be adduced *De fin.* V 75 (the interlocutor whom Cicero addresses is Piso, patron of the Peripatetic Staseas): *quod quidem eo probavi magis, quia memini Staseam . . . aliquanto ista secus dicere solitum . . . est ut dicis, inquit, sed haec ab Antiocho, familiari nostro, dicuntur multo melius et fortius.*

An example finally, the literary source of which cannot be doubted, is afforded by *Tusc.* III 38. Cicero here, in refutation of an Epicurean position, is concerned to show that he understands their teaching and does not present a distorted account of it. He thereupon sets forth with painstaking effort at exactness the Epicurean definition of happiness: *hoc dicit (Epicurus) et hoc ille acriculus me audiente Athenis senex Zeno, istorum acutissimus, contendere et magna voce dicere solebat, eum esse beatum, etc.* The involved and careful definition is then set forth, which is followed again by these emphatic words: *habes formam Epicuri vitae beatae verbis Zenonis expressam, nihil ut possit negari.* Although above Cicero had said *me audiente Athenis*, it does not admit of doubt that with the phrase *verbis Zenonis expressam*, acknowledgment is made to the written words of Zeno.¹

The principle of dialogue composition thus set forth is a natural one: it rests upon the universal psychology underlying the situation which the dialogue creates, rather than upon any recog-

¹ I find that Hirzel, without concerning himself about *me audiente*, has drawn the same conclusion from this passage. *Untersuch.* I, p. 30: "Denn das *verbis* zeigt, dass die diesen Worten vorausgehende Definition der Glückseligkeit einer Schrift Zenon's, und nicht der Erinnerung an dessen vor vielen Jahren gehaltene Vorträge entnommen war". Cf. also Susemihl II, p. 263.

nized rule of art. One might perhaps contend that it is contained implicitly in the suggestive phrase of Demetrius (De eloc. 224) ὁ διάλογος μιμνῆται αὐτοσχεδιάζοντα. Certainly it belongs to the tone and manner of unrestrained, spontaneous conversation to feel a certain pedantry (or at least flatness) in the citation of a written source and to avoid it. No one likes to confess that he got his story from *Punch*; it suits his own and the listener's sense of effectiveness much better to attribute it to personal experience or to direct communication with some person named or nameless. There is no doubt I think that the dialogue or similar dramatic literature of any language would reveal the same usage, and I have noted a number of analogous examples in the English dialogues of Bishop Hurd—who facilitates inquiry by the considerate use of learned footnotes¹. A more conspicuous instance is afforded by the acknowledgment of indebtedness which Chaucer makes to Petrarch through the mouth of the Clerke, in the prologue to the story of Griselda:

I wol yow telle a tale which that I
 Lerne at Padowe of a worthy clerk,

 Fraunceys Petrark the laureat poete.

It may be objected to my use of this example that many of the most eminent Chaucer students (amongst whom Professor Skeat and M. Jusserand as the most recent may be named) have used it literally as evidence that Chaucer first heard the story from the lips of Petrarch (and from him received a copy of the tale): but to this I should not hesitate to reply that a more comprehensive survey of the technique of such acknowledgments would have shown them on how uncertain a foundation they had based their conclusion.² The example it will be seen is absolutely parallel to the instances under II (a) above, that is, Chaucer Clerke Petrarch correspond exactly to Cicero Lucullus Antiochus, in the example there cited.

¹ So for instance in the Dialogue on the Uses of Foreign Travel (between the Earl of Shaftesbury and Locke), Hurd incorporates a story and an exact quotation from Shaftesbury's 'Characteristics', which he places in the mouth of Locke. He makes acknowledgment for this indebtedness by causing Locke to address Shaftesbury with the words: "as I have *heard* you tell the story".

² See an article by the present writer in *Modern Philology* for July, 1906: "Chaucer and Petrarch: Two Notes on the Clerkes Tale".

The conclusions set forth in the foregoing will not, I am sure, meet with any resistance from students of the philosophical dialogues; for whether they have been formulated or not, the fact remains that they have actually been recognized and followed by various investigators into the sources of those treatises. That the same phenomena have not received a similar interpretation in the *Brutus* has doubtless been due in part to the more historical character which that dialogue seems to present, and in part also to the fact that it has been far less thoroughly examined with reference to its dependence on earlier literature. But the *Brutus* is a dialogue constructed with the same artistic freedom of dramatic invention as any of the other dialogues of Cicero, and no good reason can be assigned for setting it apart from the habitual technique employed elsewhere. In cases therefore where Cicero designates personal communication as the source of his knowledge it will be open for us either to accept his statement literally, or to understand that he is casting a literary source into this more vivid form¹. The determination of any given case between these two alternatives cannot be defined by any general rules; it will depend upon the particular circumstances which each case affords. Some will be found to indicate very clearly a literary source, while others may be assigned most plausibly to the personal communication which Cicero professes.

The first example which I would note is the most important and the most extensive one which the *Brutus* affords. After characterizing Scipio and Laelius in sections 83 and 84 and pointing out the generally conceded superiority of Laelius, Cicero passes to a comparison of Laelius and Galba, based upon an historical episode derived from Rutilius Rufus, the circumstances of which are introduced as follows:

Memoria teneo Smyrnae me ex P. Rutilio Rufo audivisse, cum diceret adolescentulo se accidisse, ut ex senatus consulto P. Scipio et D. Brutus, ut opinor, consules de re atroci magnaue quaererent. Nam cum in silva Sila facta caedes esset notique homines interfecti insimulareturque familia, partim etiam liberti societatis eius quae picarias de P. Cornelio L. Mummio censoribus redemisset, decrevisse senatum, etc. (85-88).

¹ An interesting analogue from modern newspaper practice (in America at least) is the construction of 'personal interviews' with scientific or literary men upon the data afforded by their published works. The practice is not an uncommon one, attested often enough by the published protests of the gentlemen 'interviewed'.

In the interesting narrative which follows, the efforts of Laelius on behalf of the *societas* are set forth, their ill-success, and his recommendation that the case be put into the hands of Galba, by whom it was carried through to an acquittal, which Cicero represents as triumphant. The passage requires a fuller interpretation than can be given to it here, mainly to point out that Cicero has used it for a purpose alien to its original intention. For it can be shown quite certainly that Rutilius used the story as evidence with which to justify a criticism of Galba's character and oratory, and not at all as Cicero does to show the superiority of his oratorical method to that of Laelius. The episode, I think, is twice referred to by Cicero earlier, once in the *De re publica*¹ and again in the *De oratore*. But these considerations, though affording slight presumptions of literary origin, are not decisive. More significant, in reference to an event of no general historical importance, is Cicero's exact designation of the consuls—with a significant *ut opinor* deprecatory of too exact knowledge—and especially the wholly irrelevant detail of the names of the censors, from whom the corporation had obtained their concession. What would be natural for Rutilius writing out a deliberate record of his life has little plausibility for Cicero recalling the memory of a story heard thirty-two or three years before. The likelihood that the story is drawn from a written record is of course greatly enhanced by the fact that we can refer it to so natural a source as the famous memoirs of Rutilius, the *Libri de vita sua*. With the nature of such a work the tone of autobiographical reminiscence harmonizes most admirably. Its place then, as a reminiscence evoked by events of a later time, is indicated by a passage of the *De oratore* (I 227): *idemque (Rutilius) Servium Galbam, quem hominem probe commemorasse se aiebat, pergraviter reprehendere solebat, quod is, L. Scribonio quaestionem in eum ferente, populi misericordiam concitasset*. It suggests that Rutilius had told the story, to justify by the evidence of personal observation the condemnation which he visited upon Galba for his more celebrated example of emotional oratory in defending himself against the charge of perfidy to the Lusitanians.

The next passage (107) contains a group of three characterizations attributed to the poet Accius:

¹ *De re publica* III 42 *Servium Galbam, quem tu (Laelius) quoad vixit omnibus (sc. oratoribus) anteponebas. De oratore* I 227, cited below.

Vester etiam D. Brutus M. filius, ut ex familiari eius L. Accio poeta *sum audire solitus*, et dicere non inculte solebat et erat cum litteris Latinis tum etiam Graecis ut temporibus illis eruditus. Quae tribuebat idem Accius etiam Q. Maximo L. Paulli nepoti; et vero ante Maximum illum Scipionem quo duce privato Ti. Gracchus occisus esset, cum omnibus in rebus vehementem tum acrem aiebat in dicendo fuisse.

In this case there is nothing that points necessarily to a literary source, but there are some general considerations which will make such an origin seem the more probable one to assume. In the first place the disparity of age between the two men is at best very great. If we consider sixteen years as the earliest time at which Cicero might reasonably have conversed with Accius on such questions, we must assume an age of eighty years for Accius. Unfortunately we have no other data for fixing the lower limit of Accius' life than this passage affords. That his life overlapped the life of Cicero is certain: but our record affords no chronological clue subsequent to 104, the date of the Tereus. But there is no reason why we should assign these characterizations to personal communication of Accius with Cicero. For if Cicero had been in the habit of listening to Accius' conversation it would be reasonable to suppose that he should have carried away memories of other and more eminent orators than the three relatively unimportant ones named. The fact would seem to be that Accius somewhere in the course of his prolific literary activity, in dedications or prefaces addressed to friends or patrons, had used language laudatory of the oratorical and literary attainments of men in public life, which Cicero was able to employ for his purpose. Acknowledgment is made to Accius in this instance, rather than to general report (*habebatur*, etc.), because of the well-known relation of intimacy between D. Brutus and Accius, to which Cicero makes allusion elsewhere¹.

Two of the most eminent orators of Rome in Cicero's judgment were Ti. Gracchus and C. Carbo, whom Cicero groups together in 103. Concerning their pre-eminence there was no doubt—*atque hoc memoria patrum teste dicimus*, though their orations reveal the undeveloped style of their time. Gracchus died too early to reveal fully his genius; Carbo lived and his oratorical reputation bore the test of a long career.

¹ Pro Archia 27; De legg. II 54 (D. Brutum) doctum hominem sane, cuius fuit Accius perfamiliaris.

Hunc qui audierant prudentes homines, in quibus familiaris noster L. Gellius, qui se illi contubernalem in consulatu fuisse *narrabat*, canorum oratorem et volubilem et satis acrem atque eundem et vehementem et valde dulcem et perfacetum fuisse *dicebat*; addebat industrium etiam et diligentem et in exercitationibus commentationibusque multum operae solitum esse ponere (105).

Although Gellius is designated in 174 as a contemporary of Crassus and Antonius, yet since we are assured that he lived a long life, there is no reason to doubt that he may have survived into the years of Cicero's maturity. Some relationship of intimacy existed between Cicero and the family of Gellius, which is indicated here by *noster familiaris*, a term which is also used of the son, L. Gellius (consul in 72), in *De legg.* I 53. There would therefore seem to be little reason for suggesting a literary source in this case, especially since we have no knowledge of any work by the elder Gellius to which it could be referred. Still I venture to call attention to the language of this characterization, which has a certain inartistic quality, as of one picking out the significant words from a fuller account and stringing them together loosely. It is possible that the author may have been one of the Gellii, authors of *annales*, to whom reference is elsewhere made, and it is perhaps with reference to some such work that Cicero in *Brutus* 174 designates him as *nec Romanarum rerum immemor*.¹

In 169 Cicero enumerates a group of provincial orators (*apud socios et Latinos*), who are adduced mainly for the observation that their language lacks a certain color of urbanity which belongs to the orators of the city. Cicero then proceeds, in reply to Brutus' question, to illustrate this quality by an example:

Ego *memini* T. Tincam Placentinum hominem facetissimum cum familiari nostro Q. Granio praecone dicacitate *certare*. Eon', inquit Brutus, de quo multa Lucilius? Isto ipso; sed Tincam non minus multa ridicule dicentem Granio obruebat nescio quo sapore vernaculo (172).

Whether Cicero here refers to something which he had actually heard, or whether he reports a scene which had been the subject of grammatical discussion, it is not easy to determine. The latter alternative is not without probability in view of the words of Quintilian I 5, 12: *nam duos in uno nomine faciebat barbarismos Tinga Placentinus, si reprehendenti Hortensio credimus, precu-lam pro pergula dicens*.

¹ Cf. Peter, *Hist. Rom. Reliq. Proleg.*, p. 239, n. 1.

There remain two or three examples, in which although we cannot attach a name to the source used by Cicero, we are nevertheless able to discern its general nature. In 65 Cicero in characterizing Cato says:

Refertae sunt orationes amplius centum quinquaginta, quas quidem adhuc invenerim et legerim, et verbis et rebus inlustribus.

In this passage the statement that Cicero had read one hundred and fifty orations of Cato is not, of course, incredible. But it would seem remarkable and unlikely that Cicero, in the manner of a professional grammarian, had searched for and found that number. The truth is, I suspect, that Cicero here presents as the fruits of his own research and reading, the investigations of grammarians, who—in emulation of the learned activity of the Greeks—had devoted themselves to the task of bringing together and editing the scattered orations of Cato which were not contained in the Origines. The form of statement is in conformity with the general features of dialogue technique which we have thus far observed. The matter admits of no demonstration, but an illustration may serve to show the manner. Athenaeus, in a parenthetical remark concerning the Ἀσωτοδιδάσκαλος of Alexis, says (336 d): ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ ἀπήντησα τῷ δράματι· πλείονα τῆς μέσης καλουμένης κωμωδίας ἀναγνοὺς [cf. *legerim*] δράματα τῶν ὀκτακοσίων καὶ τούτων ἐκλογὰς ποιησάμενος οὐ περιέτυχον [*invenerim*] τῷ Ἀσωτοδιδασκάλῳ. Athenaeus as an interlocutor in his dialogue is under the same impulse as Cicero to maintain the fiction of independent knowledge. The true situation, however, is much clearer in his case, for no one can doubt that the research (περιέτυχον), and the reading (ἀναγνοὺς), of which he speaks, represent merely the accumulated results of several generations of Alexandrine scholars.¹

¹ Let me add here a reference to the omniscient pose of grammarians and antiquarians in such dialogues as the Deipnosophists or the Saturnalia. They are always ready to deliver ἀπὸ μνήμης an unlimited supply of erudite citations in illustration of any question which the curiosity of their fellow banqueters may raise. Quidquid de hoc mihi tenuis memoria suggererit paucis revolvam (I 3, 1) is a typical example of the introductory formulae which occur by the dozen throughout Macrobius. The matter has been touched upon briefly but suggestively by Rutherford in his recent Chapter in the History of Annotation (London, 1905, p. 32). One is tempted to press the question further and to raise the query whether, for example, Cicero in Topica 5 is not merely assuming a conventional literary pose: itaque haec, cum mecum libros non haberem, memoria repetita in ipsa navigatione conscripsi. The point of view

A larger and more perfect specimen of grammatical inquiry is preserved in 99, *à propos* of the oration of C. Fannius *de sociis et nomine Latino contra C. Gracchum*.

Tum Atticus: Quid ergo? estne ista Fanni? nam varia opinio *pueris nobis* erat. Alii a C. Persio litterato homine scriptam esse aiebant, illo quem significat valde doctum esse Lucilius; alii multos nobiles, quod quisque potuisset, in illam orationem contulisse. Tum ego: *Audivi* equidem *ista*, inquam, de maioribus natu, sed numquam sum adductus ut crederem; eamque suspicionem propter hanc causam credo fuisse, quod Fannius in mediocribus oratoribus habitus esset, oratio autem vel optima esset illo quidem tempore orationum omnium. Sed nec eius modi est ut a pluribus confusa videatur—unus enim sonus est totius orationis et idem stilus—nec de Persio reticuisset Gracchus, cum ei Fannius de Menelao Maratheno et de ceteris obiecisset; praesertim cum Fannius numquam sit habitus elinguis.

There can be no doubt I think that here we have a genuine specimen of higher criticism drawn from a learned source belonging to the time of Cicero's and Atticus' boyhood (*pueris nobis—audivi ista de maioribus natu*). The recognition of this fact may serve to cast some light upon a perplexing problem which this passage affords. Cicero distinguishes two C. Fannii, the one orator and consul, C. f., the other the son-in-law of Laelius and historian, M. f. Mommsen has shown that Cicero is in error and that the orator and the historian are one and the same person, C. Fannius, M. f. The conclusion is based upon secure inscriptional evidence and must apparently be accepted. But Cicero himself is scarcely the author of the error, but derived it from the same grammatical source as his account of the genuineness of the oration.

It would seem that this famous speech—optima illo quidem tempore omnium orationum—afforded a problem which critics had endeavored to meet in various ways. It was known to have been delivered by C. Fannius, and in the first instance the author was undoubtedly identified with the well-known historian and son-in-law of Laelius. But the pre-eminence of the speech was at variance with the general oratorical reputation of Fannius and

may perhaps be of some service in reconciling Cicero's statements concerning the source of this work with the results which investigation seems to yield. Again, is there possibly an element of literary fiction in the assurances of Seneca Rhetor that he has drawn only upon his memory for the maze of detail which he presents? But in neither of these last-named examples is there present a dramatic fiction to justify the pose, such as the dialogue by its very nature affords.

with the style of his history. This problem was met then in different ways: some contended that it was a composite product; others assigned it to C. Persius; still others, perhaps basing their contention on an erroneous form of the name, C. Fannius C.¹ f., held that its author was not identical with the son-in-law of Laelius and the historian. The latter solution was analogous to the explanation of many similar problems in Greek literature, which gave rise to a special type of works *περὶ τῶν ὁμωνύμων*.

G. L. HENDRICKSON.

¹ Peter, *Hist. Rom. frag. prol.*, p. 205, n. 1: "Gaii autem nomen facilius in annales irrepere potuit, nam C. Fannius cons. a. 161 satis fuit notus, rerum a Marco gestarum nusquam fit mentio".

V.—NOTES ON THE EVOLUTION OF ORATIO OBLIQUA.

A benevolent critic of my syntactical lucubrations has said that I seemed at times to be surprised at finding myself a grammarian. 'Il semble encore par moments s'étonner d'être grammairien' (R. de Philologie 1905, p. 167). No truer word was ever penned. I am a journalist that has lost his way or have lost my way into syntax, if not in syntax, and I have been making myself as comfortable as I could all these years in that thicket of thorns.¹ Now the first thing demanded of a journalist, in fact, of any writer, is clearness, and I congratulate myself that I never wrote a line in my life that was not crystal clear—to myself. The charges, with which I am not unfamiliar, of 'Heraclitean tenebriosity' and 'Delphic deliverances' I calmly put aside. To be sure, I know full well that syntactical crystals are not popular. The modern scholastic ideal is pulverized sugar, not rock candy; and yet, what foreign substance may not be conveyed in the spoonful of powdered stuff that is laid on the tongue of the expectant pupil? Grammar is one of the hardest of disciplines,

¹ The criticisms of my various performances are a wellspring of joy to me, as I have set forth more than once in this Journal, but among the most delightful of these *πομφολυγοπαλάσματα* is the solemn advice given to me sometime ago by somebody to model myself on Krüger. 'At fourscore' less five 'it is too late a week' to model myself on anybody, but if I have ever had a model, it has been Krüger. If I have fallen short of that model, if I have been obscure where he is simply brief, *tamen est laudanda voluntas*. It was Krüger's terseness that won my admiration from the beginning of my acquaintance with his work in 1850, when I studied up all the references in his *Anabasis* and *Thukydides*, and thus began to get some insight into Greek syntax. In fact, I was so enthusiastic about him that I seriously thought of making a pilgrimage to his retreat near Berlin, but I had heard that his temper was somewhat uncertain, and that the compiler of the '*Are-talogie des weiblichen Geschlechts*' was not altogether happy in his interior. And so I forbore. Whether he was my model or whether I simply followed my native sense of honesty, I do not know, but like him, I have tried to learn Greek from the authors and not from the grammars merely, and I am pleased to remark that he did not fool me as he fooled so many slavish copyists by his mischievous perversions of his prooftexts.

and cannot be made easy. It is best administered, if administered at all, in formulae, in 'tabloids' that will melt into the consciousness of the learner after a while. He was a great teacher, greater than many of my critics, to whom is attributed the saying that any rule is a good rule that can be understood after it is explained. A grammar is a manner of catechism. Who understands a catechism at first? I have had to stand up for my good rules, and to wait for the acceptance of my phrasings. And so, I have had a fight of afflictions for my 'resistance to pressure',¹ though it is nothing but the negative of the old conative imperfect; and I have made myself disagreeable—and all in vain—by censuring the slovenly diction of those who confound 'expectation' and 'anticipation'² just as there are those who confound 'hard' and 'obscure' in spite of Coleridge's neat distinction. But, for all that, I have coveted criticism of my style in the interest of usefulness, and I have tried to simplify my language, wherever I could do so without sacrificing what I considered truth. In fact, I am easy to be entreated, and years ago when I was more opinionated than I am now, I gave up my definition of the genitive as the case of the lacking half, in obedience to the protests of my friends. 'Lacking half' is in my judgment much better than 'complement'.

The other count of the indictment, the excessive use of figurative language applies only to the writings that are intended for the profession, and the only thing that I can plead in extenuation is the sad fact that the world does not know the worst. My printed page is to the scandalous procession of imagery, in which I indulge personally, as an orderly dame's school to the Temptation of St. Anthony; and if the secrets of the suppressed *Brief Mentions* were revealed, I should have no standing whatever among the primnesses and proprieties of the guild. And now '<ich schlage> seitwärts in die Büsche' and let whosoever will follow me into the thicket, where reposes the Dornröschen of syntax, the Optative of Oratio Obliqua. But before attacking the Optative, it is necessary to say something about Oratio Obliqua in general, or at all events, to summarize my views on this interesting and difficult subject.

If we begin with our own language, the every-day speech to which the psychological school of grammarians appeals as to

¹ A. J. P. XXII 228.

² A. J. P. XV 399, 523.

a court of last resort, we find that *Oratio Obliqua* is very common. In repeating what we have heard, we shift persons and tenses, 'do' becomes 'did', 'will' becomes 'would'. 'Shall' ought to become 'should' but is often changed into 'would' by a confusion of the point of view. After a principal tense, the tense remains, but the *Oratio Recta* 'shall' often becomes 'will', as after a past tense, it becomes 'would'. These indicatives may have barred out or else disbarred the optative in speech as they have done in literature. *Oratio Recta*, exact quotation, seems to have less scope, except in the speech of the common people, with their parenthetic 'says he' and 'says I'.

The accusative and infinitive has a limited range, chiefly, as we shall see, after verbs of saying and thinking that have creative force, and even these are little used by unbookish people. Of this more hereafter. That is our native outfit when we begin the study of Greek. To be sure, everybody is more or less sophisticated by Latin grammar, but so, for that matter, is our own language.

The first monument we encounter is Homer, and a highly artistic monument it is. In the first place we have to do with a vast mass of *Oratio Recta* discourse. Those who are disposed to ridicule statistics will do well to recall the rash statement of a reputable scholar as to the proportion of *Oratio Recta* in Homer and in Vergil.¹ The speeches in Homer, Il. and Od. together constitute half the bulk of the poems. In Vergil, 38 per cent. In Thukydides, the speeches constitute a fifth. This honest style, if we dare not call it naïve style, of reporting, holds its own in literature from the earliest to the latest time. The art of Homer and the inartificiality of the New Testament are at one in this. Among the favorite introductory words in Greek is *εἶπε* from the *εἰπέ τε μῦθον* of Homer to the *τάδ' εἶπεν* of the Attic reporter: *Δημοσθένης Δημοσθένους Παιανιεύς τάδ' εἶπεν*. Hence the preference of *εἶπε* for *ὅτι*, when the *ὅτι* stage is reached, for so far as we can judge from literature the *ὅτι* stage is later. We are centuries off from the quotation *ὅτι*, which first makes its appearance in the amateur orator Andokides. Sparingly used in classical literature, it is found in the Septuagint; it is found in the New Testament e. g. Matth. 9, 18: *προσεκύνει αὐτῷ λέγων ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν*. Everything seems to point to colloquial

¹ A. J. P. VII 398.

usage, a kind of superfoetation of the $\delta\tau\iota$ form. This $\delta\tau\iota$ form of Oratio Obliqua is so restricted in Homer that we have a right to assume that it is an extension of the familiar Homeric construction of $\delta\tau\iota$ after verbs of intellectual perception, $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \delta\tau\iota$ following the pattern of $\gamma\upsilon\omega\nu\alpha\iota\ \delta\tau\iota$. It is not a hopelessly wide step from 'he knew that' to 'he said that'. 'Saying' is, or pretends to be, an ejection of knowledge. And it is to be noted that the rule for the tenses is the same. After verbs of knowing the Homeric tenses are independent. They stand on their own bottom, and are not influenced by the leading verb. So, too, after verbs of saying.

The statistics of Schmitt¹ shew that this form of Oratio Obliqua has scarcely any scope in Homer. Even with $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\nu$ honours are easy between the acc. and inf. and the $\delta\tau\iota$ construction, which is the rule in prose, though not so exclusively as is laid down by some. Not $\delta\tau\iota$ but the accusative and infinitive is the dominant form in Greek, as it is in Latin, and the evolution follows the same lines in both languages. Verbs of Creation alike in Greek and in Latin, verbs of Will and Endeavor take the accusative and infinitive by right, and no more artificial explanation is necessary than is needed to explain accusative and dative. The tenses of the infinitive are present, aorist and perfect, and the time future, as a matter of course. The next step forward is taken when certain verbs of creation become specialized, and the element of will is deadened. $\phi\eta\mu\iota$ is not simply 'say', to begin with: it is 'aver', it is 'assert', it has the emphasis and the negative of $\delta\mu\upsilon\nu\mu\iota$. Hence the phenomenon—of which so much was once made,—that the aorist infinitive is used as a future after $\phi\eta\mu\iota$. No wonder. $\phi\eta\mu\iota$ is ultimately a verb of creation. But the differentiation sets in. The negative $\mu\acute{\eta}$ becomes the negative $\o\upsilon$, and attaches itself to the leading verb, $\o\upsilon\ \phi\eta\mu\iota$, $\o\upsilon\kappa\ \o\iota\omicron\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$; and the future infinitive fills out the scheme. The infinitive becomes the reflexion of Oratio Recta. There may have been an original future infinitive. If so, it was = $\mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\nu$ + infinitive, like the old future itself. The Latin *-rum esse, -um iri, fore ut* betray the awkwardness of the innovation. The future infinitive arose from the necessity of the case, as did the future optative long afterwards. In the further evolution, Latin accusative and infinitive and Greek accusative and infinitive go apart at many points. Especially noteworthy is the difference after verbs of sensuous perception, where the Greek

¹ A. J. P. XIV 376.

takes the participle, and inartificial Latin, the infinitive. But more important than any difference in detail is a far-reaching dissidence in principle. The Greek *Oratio Obliqua* clings closer to *Oratio Recta* than does the Latin *Oratio Obliqua*. In Greek, you can restore *Oratio Recta* from *Oratio Obliqua* with much more certainty than you can in Latin. Latin *Oratio Obliqua* is more directly conceived, whereas in Greek the image of *Oratio Recta* is far more distinctly present. The Greek translation of the *Bellum Gallicum* may be the work of a modern scholar, but it is Greek in renouncing the reproduction of Caesar's complicated *Oratio Obliqua*, and the transfer of Latin *Oratio Obliqua* to *Oratio Recta*, and *vice versa*, is often a hopeless puzzle, out of which I extracted some amusement in earlier days. As for English and German accusative and infinitive, the evolution from the native accusative and infinitive to the *Oratio Obliqua* accusative and infinitive never throve. The English verbs of saying and thinking that idiomatically take the accusative and infinitive show throughout their kindred with verbs of creation,—'declare', 'judge', 'deem' 'count'.¹ Such phrases as 'He is said to have been' betray foreign influence. They are literal translations from the Latin, which has had a dominating influence on English syntax, directly and indirectly. Interesting is the quarrel that has raged about the use of the word 'claim'. Years ago I translated '*Ait fuisse navium celerrimus*', 'claims to have been the fastest craft afloat', as a manner of mimicry of the Latin construction. I found out afterwards that Munro did not hesitate to use the word, but the late Mr. Herbert Spencer in his *Facts and Comments* objects vigorously to the use of 'claim' for 'say', 'assert', 'affirm', 'allege'. It is a verb of creation that has not been accepted as a verb of saying. To the thoughtful student of language, nothing is more interesting than these recrudescences of feeling.

As Modern Greek has discarded the infinitive, and with it the accusative and infinitive, so the Romanic languages have reverted to the finite form, with variations that I cannot undertake to discuss in detail. There are all manner of queer infinitive survivals in this domain, not the least interesting of which is the Latin historical infinitive in the form of *de* with infinitive. It is

¹See Carl Krickart, *Der Acc. mit d. Inf. in der Englischen Sprache*, besonders in der Zeit der Elisabeth. Göttingen, 1877.

a familiar Gallicism, adopted by Thackeray in a spirit of mockery, and gravely cited in that excellent little book by Leo Kellner, *English Historical Syntax*, as a specimen of a rare infinitive.

That the extension of verbs of creation to verbs of saying and thinking has but scant root in the popular consciousness is shown by the decadence of the construction, the return to primitive conditions. Hypotaxis is as old as our record, but somehow accusative and infinitive had little range in subordinate sentences. The imperative use is more primitive, and so we find the imperative infinitive in Greek hypotaxis, as we find the imperative infinitive in English hypotaxis (A. J. P. XIV 125).

The next form to be considered is the use of the optative as the representative of the indicative in *Oratio Obliqua*. 'Modusverschiebung' is a word of fear to many grammarians. It is too mechanical. Unfortunately much of language is mechanical. We inherit phrases, we inherit syntactical constructions, which are used as schemes without further analysis. Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings, as I have said elsewhere, issue conditional sentences that are as faultlessly constructed as if the speakers had learned all the wisdom of the Egyptians and penetrated all the Egyptian darkness of psychological syntax. All that we can do is to watch the types of conditional sentences that are preferred, and build our psychological structure on those preferences. Doubtless the 'Modusverschiebung' has its *raison d'être*. The subjunctive under the influence of the less real past becomes optative, just as the wish is less real than the command. But, however we may account for it, the transfer is there, and what is more, it abides from Homer down to the sophistic age (A. J. P. XXIII 129). There is, however, no optative for indicative in Homer except in the question. Here the optative does represent the indicative, as it does the subjunctive. Even *ὥς ἔλθοι* Od. 24, 237 is to be considered interrogative (S. C. G. § 310), for the line between relative and interrogative is often blurred to the Greek consciousness. Compare the notable instance in Pind. O. 6, 49: *εἵπετο παῖδα τὸν Εὐάδνα τέκοι* where *τέκοι* is due to *εἵπετο*. This optative, then, is a pseudo-optative, to begin with. The case is analogous to that of the diphthongal *εἶ*, in which we distinguish between the real *εἶ* in *γένοι*, and the false *εἶ* in *εἶς*. In time this pseudo-optative spread to other indicatives and actually generated a future optative to match the other tenses just as the *Oratio Obliqua* infinitive generated a future infinitive to match

the other infinitives. The first example occurs Pind. O. 9, 116: *σχήσει* in an interrogative complex, and everyone must have noticed how often the indicative of the future is retained, as if in protest against the usurper. In fact, we may say that there is a constant fight against the optative in the dependent clauses. It is felt to be unsatisfactory, to be ambiguous, and the whole thing is 'turned into hell' with a lot of more or less artificial constructions. The Oratio Obliqua optative falls away early. One cannot help asking whether it had any deep root in the popular consciousness. It was kept alive by a kind of mechanical 'Modusverschiebung'. As the infinitive in Oratio Obliqua took on an alien negative, so the optative in Oratio Obliqua took on an alien negative, such as it had taken on with the potential optative, when the language was feeling its way to more exact futures. But the Oratio Obliqua optative cannot be called a potential, cannot be subsumed under the potential. Doubtless, there was a super-induced feeling of irresponsibility, such as we find in the latest form of Oratio Obliqua, *ὥς* with the participle. But the fact that its construction is limited to the dependence on historical tenses is significant of its origin, and we have no right to assume that the sporadic appearance of an optative after a principal tense shows the basic condition of things. In fact, it might be contended that the 'partial obliquity'—*ὥς* with the participle—came in to supply the need for a form of universal applicability. The few optatives after principal tenses in the Greek of the classic period are nearly all susceptible of easy explanation—and those of a later day do not count. They belong to the artificial literature of a time when the optative was practically dead.

The English optative of Oratio Obliqua seems also to be dead, or to live on in the language of the vulgar and in the dialects. One hears sometimes, 'He said that he were'. Indeed, the English optative (subj.) seems to be doomed. The indicative and sundry forms of periphrastic conjugation have taken its place. The books make a difference between 'If I am' and 'If I be', 'before I am' and 'before I be', but even such broad differences as separate 'If I were' and 'If I was' are often effaced. 'Lest I be' holds its own after a fashion, but periphrasis is often substituted. Still the optative (subj.) is not dead. Where form survives anywhere, function survives everywhere. We speak of a nominative and accusative, a genitive-dative dual, because there are nominative and accusative, genitive and dative forms

elsewhere. The dative and ablative plural in Latin are dative and ablative, because the dative and ablative are differentiated elsewhere. We have in English nominative and objective cases, by reason of the pronominal forms. The optative (subj.) singular of the verb keeps the plural alive. Nay, I had fainted = I should have fainted, is not felt as an indicative—so there may be, after all, an English Oratio Obliqua Optative (subj.)—as there is a German Oratio Obliqua Optative (subj.). But what is the evidence for a Latin Oratio Obliqua Subjunctive outside the dependent clauses?¹ All the passages cited fall into the category of surprise, and the first movement of surprise is deprecatory, whether the news is good or bad, so that we are in the sphere of the optative of wish, and we are reminded of Dittmar's definition of the subjunctive. This subjunctive of surprise, when it is introduced by a particle, resembles very closely the accusative with infinitive of surprise. Both forms offer an objection. 'The one <accusative and infinitive> objects to the idea; the other to any state of things that could produce the result' (L. G.³ 558 N.). But any such differentiation in Greek would be impossible, as there is only one form, the infinitive,—in the later language largely with the article. The surprise lies in the question, which is extra-linguistic, if I may say so. But to derive the whole structure of Optative Oratio Obliqua from dephlogisticated surprise does not commend itself absolutely. Call it a deprecation of responsibility, and we seem to be nearer the mark. And this is the feeling that may have been superinduced in Greek, even if the origin is as mechanical as it seems to have been. Thought works itself into expression in a variety of ways, and there are remarkable interchanges between infinitive and optative that are not to be neglected in this whole range of study, so that I have ventured to call the optative, the finite form of the infinitive. In English, the nominal infinitive goes hand in hand with an ideal periphrastic 'To do' 'that he should do', 'to have done' 'that he should have done'—both idealistic. The two Oratio Obliqua forms are closely related. A remarkable development of an Oratio Obliqua or rather a Partial Obliquity form is *ὥς* with the participle. It is not an abridged conditional proposition, though the Romans so conceived it, for nothing is plainer than the fact that the *tamquam* c. subj. of silver Latin was an imitation of this construction, which has in it the same shifting of responsibility that has been noticed

¹ See J. J. Schlicher, A. J. P. XXVI 73.

in the optative Oratio Obliqua. The negative is not the negative of the conditional participle, but the negative of the optative in Oratio Obliqua. The $\omega\varsigma$ retains the subjective character, which it has largely, though not wholly, lost in the combination with the finite verb. $\text{o}\dot{\upsilon}\chi\ \omega\varsigma$ with the participle corresponds to *non quod* with the subjunctive, and the language enriches itself, though comparatively late, with an easy way of shifting responsibility. $\delta\tau\epsilon$ causal with the optative is one of the rarest of combinations, $\omega\varsigma$ with the participle reigns in its stead; and it may not be without interest to observe that $\omega\varsigma$ with the participle, an evasion of responsibility for a statement of fact, follows in the wake of $\omega\sigma(\tau\epsilon)$ with the infinitive, an evasion of responsibility for the expression of purpose.

BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Ancient Legends of Roman History. By ETTORE PAIS.
Translated by MARIO E. COSENZA. New York, Dodd,
Mead and Company, 1905. Pp. xiv, 336. \$4.00 net.

This book consists of a series of lectures written by Professor Pais for the Lowell Institute and several American universities. Among the subjects treated are "The Excavations in the Roman Forum", "The Origins of Rome", "Acca Larentia", "Tarpeia", "The Saxum Tarpeium", "The Legends of Servius Tullius", "The Legends of the Horatii and the Cult of Vulcan", "The Fabii at the River Cremera", "The Legends of Lucretia and of Virginia", and "The Topography of the Earliest Rome". In each case Pais endeavors to establish by a special and detailed demonstration the views which he has set forth more succinctly in his *Storia di Roma*. These are, he claims, "the logical conclusion of an objective and untiring examination of facts".

In his first chapter he sketches the development of the critical method from Lorenzo Valla through Beaufort and Niebuhr to Mommsen. To Beaufort he pays a special tribute. Niebuhr introduced greater precision of method, but the principles upon which he worked were in no respect sounder than those of the French scholar. While fully recognizing Mommsen's great contributions, Pais thinks that he erred in placing too much reliance upon the *Fasti* as a source for Roman constitutional history. He is of the opinion that a minute and careful examination of the political constitution makes it clear that there is in it the same impurity of sources that is generally acknowledged in the case of the narratives of external events. He holds that the official story of the Roman constitution was derived in great part from annalistic sources of the first century B. C., nor did these annalists possess monumental *Fasti* to which they could refer. The *Fasti Capitolini* do not represent the most ancient sources but are dependent upon recent works. They are to be classed with the *elogia* of the Augustan age. They are the result of the researches of scholars—men who begin with the generation of Varro, Cicero, and Cornelius Nepos. There is no reason for attributing greater value to them than to the records of triumphs. The majority of the Roman annalists were patriots. They were, too, genealogists and demagogues rather than true historians. They obscured the truth of the early national history with their countless and more or less deliberate falsifications.

With Pais' contention that early Roman history must be tested by a rigorously critical method no one will join issue. Much of

what he sets forth with such vehemence has been regarded as axiomatic for generations. It is, indeed, somewhat surprising that he should devote so much space to a plea for a method which every judicious reader would assume to be the only possible one. It would almost seem as if Professor Pais thought that the hysterical interpretation of the monuments recently uncovered in the Forum—which saw in them a confirmation of some of the stories of early Rome—had been widely and favorably received in this country. But while there will be no dissent from the principles of investigation laid down by Professor Pais, many readers will hesitate to accept some of the “demonstrations” that are offered in the treatment of the different legends. While quick to recognize the erudition, the ingenuity, the extraordinary swiftness of combination that some of the essays show, students of Roman history and Roman religion will, in numerous instances, be extremely doubtful whether the author’s results are securely based on that foundation of fact of which he himself speaks so often.

For example, in the second essay, on what seems to be wholly insufficient data he is inclined to think that the archaic stele in the Forum records the memory of sacred ceremonies performed in honor of Soranus. The most tangible piece of evidence which he adduces in favor of this theory is the occurrence of the fragmentary word *sora* in the inscription. Furthermore, basing his statement on the “explicit testimony of ancient texts” he adds that the god Soranus represented at the same time both the light and the darkness. As a parallel to this double function he adds that we “know” that Vulcanus represented the diurnal activity of the Sun, Summanus the nocturnal. What does the “explicit testimony” amount to? In Virgil, *Aen.* XI 785, in Plin. *N. H.* VII 19, and in some passages in Silius Italicus, Soranus is identified with Apollo; while in Servius’ note on the Virgilian passage he is identified with Dis pater. Servius probably had the true conception of the god, but the identification with Apollo is, as Wissowa has shown, almost certainly an error. Moreover, there is no evidence that Vulcanus was a sun god; and what little we know of Summanus does not point in that direction.

In discussing the age of the inscribed stele Pais shows a tendency to assign it to a later period than scholars generally have done. His position is that there is no proof that it is earlier than 387 B. C. (the Gallic fire), and he claims that there is nothing to exclude the possibility of its having been inscribed in the years immediately following that catastrophe. He argues that the external form of the stele, the vertical boustrophedon direction of the writing, the diacritic marks, and the archaic forms of the letters are by no means final evidence of a great antiquity. For the direction of the writing he cites parallels from Magna Graecia and from Venetia, which he puts as late as the third century B. C. The archaic lettering is compared with that on many monuments

of Picenum, of the Marrucini, of the Paeligni, the Marsi, and the Veneti. Even the closed \square , perhaps the most archaic form on the stele, appears on the Etruscan tegula, which Pais thinks may be as late as the third century. The muster of evidence is indeed, from some points of view, a remarkable one, and Professor Pais gives abundant proofs of the range of his erudition. But his argument is not convincing. In some cases he does not establish clearly the date of those monuments with which he compares the stele. Moreover, archaic forms and other characteristics of antiquity would naturally linger longer in the more remote parts of Italy than in Rome. The provincial inscriptions are not a fair criterion. It is hardly likely that an inscription in Rome, showing such an aggregation of archaic characteristics, could be later than the fifth century. That the monument rests upon a stratum later than that representing the era of the Gallic fire (see Studniczka, *Jahreshefte d. oesterr. Arch. Instituts* VI 146 ff.), does not seriously decrease the probability of this date. It was probably replaced upon the new level after the fire.

In his chapter on the origin of Rome, Pais offers a new derivation of the name of the city. Basing his conjecture partly on the prominent place given to the *figus Ruminalis* in the recently discovered Pompeian fresco, and partly on other data, he suggests that the name Roma was derived from the *figus Ruminalis*. The tree in turn (*caprificus*, fig-tree) was called *Ruminalis* from the nursing breast, *rumis* (from which milk flows), because a milky juice flows from its fruit. Enlarging upon this theme he points out the conspicuous place given to the *figus Ruminalis* in early legends, e. g. its transfer to the Comitium when the Forum Romanum became the centre of the enlarged city. That the early Romans should have named their city from the fig-tree, which so many peoples regarded as the emblem of fruitfulness, Pais thinks quite natural. He compares *Ficana* and *Ficulea*, and adds examples of cities, the names of which were derived from other trees. In all this we see that ingenuity and cleverness which is so marked a characteristic of Pais' work, but his arguments are far from being conclusive. His theory does not rank higher than an etymological possibility. His identification of the tree in the fresco as the *figus Ruminalis* is reasonably certain, but he seems to emphasize unduly its importance as an element in the picture. Moreover, its transfer to the Comitium is satisfactorily accounted for by the fact of its sacred associations, which of course no one disputes. The parallels which Professor Pais draws from the names of American cities derived from trees (e. g. *Oakland*, *Red Oak*, and *Cypress City*) are not to be taken seriously.

In his treatment of *Acca Larentia*, Pais endeavors to prove that *Acca Larentia* is simply the mother of the *Lares*. The difference of quantity in *Lares* and *Larentia* does not, he thinks, constitute a serious objection to this theory. Both Mommsen and Wissowa seem to him to have failed to understand the fundamental char-

acter of the divinity. He draws attention to certain points of contact between the cult of Larentia and that of Angerona, of Dia, of Bona Dea, and of Flora, and finally reaches the conclusion that Larentia was identical with Bona Dea. But Professor Pais has failed to establish either that Larentia was the mother of the Lares, or that she and Bona Dea were identical. The former of these two theories is, it will be remembered, a very old one. It has been asserted and denied again and again. A detailed argument in favor of it is to be found in De Marchi's *Culto Privato*; while Wissowa has declared against it. Pais, like the earlier advocates of the theory, appeals to the account of Lara, Larunda, Tacita, and Muta, given by Ovid in his *Fasti*. That our author, with his ideals of historical criticism, should place such credence in a poet's fancies cannot fail to be a matter for surprise. Nor are there sufficient reasons for his assumption that the Lares are deities of a sepulchral character. The ultimate significance of the cult of the Lares is still a debatable question. The trend of the saner criticism, however, is away from the theory that they were sepulchral divinities. Furthermore, his identification of Acca Larentia and Bona Dea has not a sound basis. He himself (p. 67) recognizes that he is on dangerous ground here. The wholesale identification of similar or allied cults was one of the besetting sins of the ancient critics and has introduced untold confusion into the history of Roman religion. Pais seems to fall into the same error.

The chapter (V) on Tarpeia begins with a summary of the different versions of the legend—those found in Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, Calpurnius Piso, Propertius, and other authors. A skilful analysis brings out the elements common to them all; and the citation of more than one Greek legend of the same general character (e. g. the story of the Naxian Polycrita and that of the Lesbian Peisidike) leads to the conclusion that in the myth of Tarpeia we are dealing with one of the many Hellenic legends localized on Roman soil by the Greeks who first narrated the history of the Latin city. Professor Pais does not of course set this forth as a new theory. The influence of Greek legends upon the story has long been recognized. A detailed investigation of the subject has recently been published by Sanders in the *University of Michigan Studies*, 1905, pp. 1-47. So far as the ultimate source of the legend is concerned, Pais' view is, in all probability, the correct one, but the same cannot be said of his explanation of the local elements in it. His statement is "Tarpeia was originally a beneficent deity . . . she is the personification of the Mons Tarpeius which was called Capitolinus only after the erection by the Tarquins of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. In truth the words Tarpeius and Tarquinius are but two forms of the same word" (p. 105). Even if the etymology were correct, there would be no evidence here that Tarpeia was ever regarded as the tutelary divinity of the hill. Certainly the references to the

Vestal Tarpeia do not lead to this conclusion. The explanation offered by Sanders is more probable, namely, that the rock was named from the gens Tarpeia who lived upon it; that the Vestal Tarpeia, who appears in some of the versions, was a member of this family, and was buried in that vicinity; and that it was the proximity of her tomb to the place identified with the execution of those who had been guilty of treason which resulted in her being transformed into the traitor of the legend.

In Chap. VI Pais reopens the old question of the site of the Saxum Tarpeium. He places it on the northern part of the hill, where the Arx and the temple of Juno Moneta were. His arguments, however, have not the weight of those advanced by Jordan, Gilbert, Richter, and Huelsen in favor of the southern site.

One of the most interesting parts of the book is that dealing with Servius Tullius. Professor Pais' analysis shows clearly the legendary character of the various achievements attributed to that king. For example it was said that he had abolished the nexum; but it is probable that this was not done away with till the end of the fourth century B. C. It was Servius Tullius who was supposed to have divided the city into four urban tribes; but it was only in 304 B. C. that these four tribes were formed. Legend said that Servius laid the foundations of the temple of Diana Aventinensis with the purpose of compelling the Latins to acknowledge the supremacy of Rome; but such supremacy was not attained till a far later period. It is likewise stated that Servius Tullius, after the conquest of the Etruscans, erected a temple to Fortuna on the right bank of the Tiber and a second one to Mater Matuta in the Forum Boarium; it is probable, however, that the latter was erected only in the time of Furius Camillus, and the former by the consul Carvilius. Further, there is no evidence that Servius Tullius was the first to coin money. Nor does the Servian wall belong to the time at which he was supposed to have lived. It is a structure of the fourth century B. C. Pais is at his best in this part of the essay. But when he comes to his explanation of the origin of the legend he is not so successful. By a series of daring and in many cases manifestly improbable combinations and parallels he attempts to show that Servius Tullius, associated as he was with the cult of Diana Aventinensis, was identical with the *servus rex* of the cult of Diana at Lake Nemi.

The treatment of the other legends cannot be discussed in detail. The myths of Horatius Cocles and Mucius Scaevola are traced to the influence of local monuments. The analysis of the story of the three hundred and six Fabii—a composite of Greek legend, Roman history, and Latin topography—is one of the most satisfactory in the book.

The typography of the book is reasonably good. I have noticed only the following misprints: *memorensis* (p. 144),

conception (p. 58), Compilalicia (p. 66), Ambarvalio (p. 65). On p. 58 Palilia occurs; elsewhere the better attested form of the word (Parilia) is used. The general appearance of the page would have been improved if the paragraphs had been a little more deeply indented. The illustrations, on the mechanical side, are good. Their purpose, however, seems to be decorative rather than illustrative.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

G. J. LAING.

Anecdota Oxoniensia: Classical Series. Part X. The Vetus Cluniacensis of Poggio. By A. C. CLARK. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1905.

Clark's new volume in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia* is concerned with a Cluni MS of Cicero's orations, and makes a still more valuable contribution, if possible, than its predecessor did, to the study of the text of Cicero. The *Vetus Cluniacensis* contained the orations pro Milone, pro Caelio, pro Cluentio, pro Roscio, and pro Murena, and is the archetype of all existing copies of the Rosciana and Mureniana. Consequently its importance can hardly be overestimated, yet strangely enough it has hitherto received very scant attention. As Clark concisely puts it, for Cicero's speeches "the MSS have been not weighed but numbered."

In this paper he addresses himself to the task of tracing the history, so far as it can be followed, of the lost *Cluniacensis*, and of determining the relations which its descendants bear to it and to one another. By a clever bit of reasoning he identifies it with no. 496 in the twelfth-century catalogue of Cluni, in which catalogue, it will be remembered, Peterson's Holkham MS was set down as no. 498. Clark's Cluni MS antedates the Caroline reform in spelling, and cannot, therefore, be later than the end of the eighth century. From it we have a French and an Italian tradition. The French tradition is best represented by Σ (= Lat. 14.749) in the Paris library. This MS gives us in full from the *Cluniacensis* the speeches pro Murena and pro Sex. Roscio and marginalia to the pro Milone, pro Caelio, and pro Cluentio. From Σ are derived Par. 6369, Par. 7777, and Wolfenbüttel. 205. One of the best representatives of the Italian tradition is Laur. LIV. 5, which contains excerpts made from the Cluni MS by Bartolommeo da Montepulciano, the friend of its discoverer, Poggio. It was the identification of these excerpts in the Laurentian library which gave Clark his first important clue in establishing the relations which the existing representatives of *Cluniacensis* bear to one another. The connection of certain other Italian MSS with Poggio's is also clearly determined, although Clark was unable to find the copy which Poggio caused to be

made for himself in 1427. Here is an interesting quest for some other Ciceronian scholar. From the brief summary which has been given here of the results of Clark's investigations it is clear that his paper puts the study of the text of the orations mentioned above on a new and scientific basis. The two MSS which have been mainly followed for the *pro Sex. Roscio* are shown to be comparatively worthless by the side of Σ . Similarly for the *pro Cluentio* ST must give way before the newly discovered marginalia, while equally valuable contributions are made to our knowledge of the text of the *pro Milone* and the *pro Caelio*. Even if the results were not so valuable every classical student is under obligation to the writer of this paper for an opportunity to read a very stimulating and delightful piece of constructive reasoning. The reviewer does not recall having read any detective story which surpasses in suspended interest and in keenness of deduction Clark's account of the way in which he identified the Laurentian excerpts and thereby made out the history of the other descendants of the *Vetus Cluniacensis*.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK, VOL. VII.

Pp. 1-23. A. Otto, Staatliche und private Einrichtungen und Berufsarten im Sprichwort.

23-24. A. Funck, Clanculum—clanculo—clancule. Questions the correctness of Stowasser's etymology of clanculum in Vol. VI, p. 563. Munitare. The word is not ἀπαξ εἰρημένον in Cic. Rosc. Amer. 140, but occurs in Corp. Gloss. IV, 259, 43 (cod. Sangall.). The frequentative form suggests comedy as its source.

24. O. Keller, Fer=Ferraria. Would give this meaning, in the general sense of metal-works, to Fer on the lead-bars from the harbor of New Carthage (Arch. Zeit. 1884, I, 71) instead of Ferox.

25-64. G. Gröber, Vulgärlateinische Substrate romanischer Wörter. Conclusion, general summary, inferences as to the chronological relations of the Romance languages.

64. L. Havet, Nictire. This form, instead of nictere, is probable in Ennius on metrical grounds, as well as from the analogy of mugire, hinnire, etc.

65-72. M. Ihm, Vulgärformen lateinischer Zahlwörter auf Inschriften. A collection of examples of the cardinals, ordinals, and multiplicatives.

73-102. A. Funck, Was heisst "Die Kinder"? An historical and lexicographical study of the various words for "children": liberi, pueri, infantes, nati, parvuli, etc.

103-113. Ph. Thielmann, Usque ad, usque in, II. Usque sub, super, post, ante. A continuation of the article in Vol. VI, pp. 75 ff., with a similar treatment of usque sub, etc.

113-114. H. Schuchardt, Lausa. Apropos of the reading lausam in Plaut. Truc. 731, S. points out the danger of adding to the Latin vocabulary words inferred from Romance forms, and then making these the basis of Romance words.

114. H. Kothe, Ueber die Ableitung von praestare. Would separate transitive and intransitive praestare and derive the former from praes, surety, bondsman.

115-131. E. Wölfflin, Der Genetivus comparationis und die präpositionalen Umschreibungen. The earlier examples of the

genitive are to be explained by ellipsis of *quam*. The genitive began to prevail towards the end of the second century, especially in the works of the juristic writers, who were, for the most part, not native Romans. This later use may be explained, like the earlier, by ellipsis of *quam*, but is more probably due to Greek influence. There follows a discussion of the prepositional phrases, *ab* with the ablative, *prae* with the ablative, and the like, which are used in place of the ablative and the genitive of comparison.

132. A. Miodoński, *Zur Erklärung der Infinitive auf -ier, -rier*. Criticises Brugmann's derivation of these forms from the preposition *ar*. Suggests that owing to the difficulty of distinguishing such forms as *bibi* (perf. ind. act.) and *bibi* (pres. inf. pass.) a form *bibier* arose, formed on the analogy of *biber*=*bibere*.

133-146. E. Wölfflin, *Zur Psychologie der Völker des Altertums*. A study, based on lexical grounds, of the characteristics of the peoples of Africa, Asia, and Greece.

147-183. F. Cramer, *Absum*. Lexicon article with explanatory notes.

183. L. Traube, *Captiosus, auf Jagd bedacht*. Testimony to *caciare*=*captiare*, derived from the *Life of the h. Germanus* by Heric of Auxerre. The word is found in a letter included in the preface to the *Life*, which goes back to the sixth century.

184. A. Funck, *Colitor=cultor*. Cites an instance of this form from an inscription of Belgrade.

J. Wrobel, *Uncinulus*. This word occurs in the *Ambraser codex* (seventh century) of the *Praefatio in librum de benedictionibus Iudae of Rufinus Aquileiensis* (Migne XXI, 299).

185-206. E. Wölfflin, *Absumo-absurdus*. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes.

207-267. J. Stöcklein, *Abundabilis-abundans*. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes on *abunde* and *abundus*.

267-268. Ph. Thielmann, *Psaltrix*. This word, of which the vulgar form is *saltrix*, should be read in *Vu¹. eccli. 9, 4* and recognized by the lexicons. *Ictuatus*. Another example of this word (see III, 251) in a gloss. *Sine causa* = *frustra*. An earlier example (see II, 22) in *Bell. Alex. 39, 1*. *Silbentrennung*. The division *Ca-dmi* is indicated in *Carm. Priap. 67*.

268-280. *Miscellen*.—M. Bréal. *Suum cuique*. Döderlein in 1838 anticipated Bücheler and the writer in recognizing Umbrian *subocau* as a perfect, and Philip Buttmann in 1803 called attention to the connection of Sanscrit with the languages of Europe.

W. Schmitz, *Malacia*. Infers from the *Tironian Notes*, 135, 2, Gruter, the existence of a goddess of that name. *Arsio-Rocitudo*. Calls attention to the occurrence of these words in the

Anthidotum Egias. Septizonium. Approves Hülsen's view that the name is derived from seven girdle-like strips formed by the architectural members of the building. Cites from the Tironian Notes evidence that the word is not derived from saepio.

J. W. Beck, Allobrox, ein Spitzname. Notes that Allobroge, with the meaning "rustic", occurs in the dictionary of Furetière, ed. of 1701, and in the Dict. de l'Académie of 1762.

G. Helmreich, Zu den Glossen von Epinal. Criticisms of Nettleship's notes in the Journal of Philology, XVII, No. 33, pp. 120-124.

G. Landgraf, Egens=exgens. Since indiges (indigens) has the double meaning of "native" and "poor", suggests that egens may sometimes be synonymous with extorris.

L. Bauer, Absto. Would read abstabat in Sil. Ital. XII, 480 and add the example to those cited in Vol. VI, p. 539.

E. Wölfflin, Necare. The word originally meant to kill without weapons. Zur Konstruktion von clam. The accusative is more common than the ablative. In Bell. Hisp. 18 clam a Caesaris praesidiis, the a is not the preposition, but a correction of praesidiis to praesidia, which has found its way into the text. Cn. Cornelius Scipio Asina. Would explain the cognomen Asina as meaning "afraid of water", on the basis of Plin. NH. VIII, 69.

281-311. Review of the Literature for 1889, 1890.

311-312. Sixth Annual Report.

313-331. K. Rittweger and E. Wölfflin, Was heisst "das Pferd"? A full abstract, with additions and corrections, of R.'s dissertation De equi vocabulo et cognominatis, Halle, 1890.

332. E. Wölfflin, Hoc=huc. The form hoc is used by some of Cicero's correspondents, while Cicero himself uses only huc. Caesar always has huc, while examples of hoc occur in the Bell. Afr., Bell. Alex., and Bell. Hisp. Hence huc was the high Latin and hoc the vulgar form, and the use of hoc=huc is earlier than it is said to be by Bücheler, Lat. Deklin., p. 102.

333-342. E. Wölfflin, Zur Psychologie der Völker des Altertums. A continuation of the article on pp. 133 ff., dealing with Rome and Italy.

343-388. Ph. Thielmann, Der Ersatz des Reciprocums im Lateinischen. A lexicographical study of inter se; alter alterum, alius alium; invicem, mutuo, vicissim; pariter, simul and the like, with a discussion of the use of the reflexive as a reciprocal pronoun in Romance.

389-407. F. Cramer, Absens. Lexicon article with explanatory notes.

408. P. Geyer, *Inante, incontra, desubtus*. Additions to the collections of Hamp in Vol. V, pp. 321 ff.

M. Petschenig, *Ruribus*. Cites an indubitable instance of this form in Augustine, *Contra litteras Petilianas*, III, 31, 36, in support of his own conjecture in Corippus, *Ioh.* VI, 244.

409-420. J. Stöcklein, *Abundantia—abundatio*. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes.

420. E. Wölfflin, *Die Konzessivsätze*. Points out that they are related to comparative and proportional clauses, as well as to conditional and causal clauses.

421-434. E. Wölfflin, *Abusio—abutor*. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes.

435-445. *Miscellen.*—A. Zimmermann, *Etymologische Versuche*. Would derive *augur* from the abstract *augus* seen in *augus-tus*; *rusticus* from *rus-tus*; *Sallustius* from *salus-tus*. *Paenitet, oportet*. Regards these words as frequentatives from *poenio* (*punio*) and *oporior*. *Necesse est*. From *cessim* (*cessis*).

E. Klebs, *Lautus und Aurelius Victor*, *Caes.* 10, 5. Takes *opere lautus* in this passage as the pure Latin equivalent for *thermae*. Victor shows a tendency to avoid the use of Greek words.

Fr. Schöll, *In fugam convertere*, *Caes. B. G.* I, 52. Would read *conversa* with α and not *coniecta* with Meusel and β . The reading of β is a proof that that class of MSS deserves the name "interpolated". *Fronti praeponere olivam*, *Hor. Carm.* I, 7, 7. Suggests taking *fronti* in the sense of *frons libelli*; cf. *Ovid, Trist.* I, 7, 32.

P. Mohr, *Zu Sidonius*. In *Epist.* II, 1, 1, would read *quique* with the MSS, instead of Lütjohann's *quippe*.

C. Frick, *Colpus—colfus—colfora*. Differs with Gröber, in Vol. II, p. 442, in regarding *colpus* as intermediate between *κόλπος* and *golfus*. *Assis*. This is doubtful as a feminine form; see Vol. V, p. 566.

J. M. Stowasser, *MEITA*. This form, which was assumed by Wölfflin in Vol. VI, p. 200, actually occurs in Varro, *Ling. Lat.* VII, 8. *Comitare* has but one fundamental meaning, namely "go"; *mēta* is *meita* used as a substantive.

W. Meyer-Lübke, *Malacia*. Suggests that Italian *bonaccia*, "calm", is from **bonacia*, a new form from *malacia*; there is no trace of the latter word in the Romance languages.

446-465. Review of the Literature for 1889, 1890, and 1891.

465-466. Announcement of a lexicon of Latin personal names by Prof. A. Zimmermann.

466. A reply by F. Heerdegen to H.'s review in this volume, p. 288. A correction of J. Stöcklein's statement in this volume, p. 263 by J. H. Schmalz.

467-484. E. Wölfflin, Minucius Felix, Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des afrikanischen Lateins. An introduction on the general characteristics of vulgar Latin in general and African Latin in particular is followed by an examination of the Latinity of the Octavius. Whether the writer of the Octavius was a native of Africa or not cannot be determined. Would place him chronologically between Apuleius and Tertullian.

485-506. A. Funck. Neue Beiträge zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Adverbia auf -im. Gives a list of 56 adverbs in -im which are not found in the seventh edition of Georges, but are certain as regards text and meaning. This is followed by a list of 11, also not in Georges, which are less well attested, and one of 54, for which new and important examples have been found in addition to those cited by Georges.

506. E. Wölfflin, Af. Two examples of this form, both before V, from an inscription of Amiternum. There is a third instance of af in the same inscription, but the following word is not preserved.

507-522. E. Wölfflin, Zwei Gutachten über das Unternehmen eines lateinischen Wörterbuchs. Reports favorable action on the part of the Prussian and Bavarian Academies, and gives an abstract of Hertz's address to the former.

522. G. Gröber, Zu colpus, colfus. A reply to Frick's note on p. 443.

523-526. R. Thurneysen, Zur Bezeichnung der Reciprocität im gallischen Latein. A criticism of the article of Thielmann on pp. 343 ff. from evidence based on the Romance languages.

527. F. Skutsch, Iaiutare, iaiunus. Would read iaientaculum in Plaut. Curc. 72 f. and iaiunus in 574. Would assume the spelling with a for Plautus.

529-568. C. Weyman, Abyssus-accedo. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes.

568. Max Bonnet, Mare femininum. Mare in this gender occurs in Gregory of Tours.

E. Wölfflin, Eine Alliteration Caesars. Reconstructs de victoria de vita certavi from Plutarch, Caes. 56 and Appian, B. C. II, 104.

569-578. E. Wölfflin, Accelebro-accendo. Lexicon articles with explanatory notes.

578. H. Nettleship, Absanitas=insanitas. Should be read in Varro, Eumenides apud Non. I, 67, 16 M., where codd. F, H,¹ and L have adsanitas; cf. abnormis and abnormitas.

579-598. Miscellen.—J. Netušil, Zur Etymologie und Semasiologie von *iste* und *ipse* nebst Zubehör. Regards *te* and *se* in these words as originally datives, so that *iste*=*is-te*, "der dir", one who stands in some relation to you, unless *te* has merely the force of the so-called ethical dative. *Ipse*=*i-pe-se*, one who stands in some relation to the subject of the sentence.

E. Wölfflin, Zur Konstruktion der Ländernamen. Aegyptus and Epirus omit the preposition in expressing relations of place because they end in *-us*, like the names of many islands, while most names of countries end in *-ia*.

A. Funck, Inschriftliche Zeugnisse für lateinische Verwandtschaftsnamen. The results of an examination of 2039 inscriptions from Ostia, CIL. XIV. Formelhafte Wendungen im Inschriftenlatein. Shows that *benemerenti* and similar expressions lose their force and become mere stereotyped expressions like German "Wohlgeboren". Epithets like *pious*, *carus*, and *dulcis* are transferred from the dead to the mourner by the uneducated through lack of clearness of thought.

G. Gundermann, Malacia. Points out that the word has the meaning "calm" in *Actus Petri cum Simone*, *Acta Apost. Apocr.* ed. Lipsius, 1², 1891. Suggests that the word is a *terminus technicus* from the language of sailors, which would account for its rare occurrence in literature. Cf. pp. 270 and 445 and Vol. VI, p. 259. *Gubernius*—*Gubernus*. The former word, which was used by *Laberius* and is discussed by *Gell.* XVI, 7, 10, where *Ribbeck* would read *gubernus*, occurs twice in the *Actus Petri cum Simone*, ed. Lipsius. The correct reading in *Gellius* is therefore probably *gubernius*. *Gubernus* also existed in vulgar Latin, and Greek had the corresponding forms *κυβέρνιος* and *κύβερνος*.

E. Wölfflin, *Fluvius*—*fluvia*—*flumen*. Notes on the use or avoidance of these synonymous terms by various writers.

L. Traube, *Expiare*. Should be read instead of *explere* in *Val. Max.* VIII, 11, 7: cf. VIII, 1, *Damn.* 8.

B. Kübler, Juristisches. The juristic literature separated *boves* and *iumentum* and reckoned them with *pecus*, where they formed the special class of *armentum*. *Armentum* is derived from *aro*, but by the ancients was falsely connected with *arma*. The term meant in general horses and oxen, but was restricted by the Jurists to the latter signification. In view of these facts K. would read *dumtaxat* for *etiam*, the false reading being due to confusion of the abbreviations for these words, in *Mod. Dig.* 32, 81, 3. There follows a note on *Fronto*, V, 42 (57), p. 88, N., where K. would read *in integrum* and *in solutum*, and one on *Fronto*, I, 5, p. 103 N., where he suggests *defero* for *desero*. *Die Appendix Probi*. Further evidence for the African origin of this work.

S. Brandt, Zu den präpositionalen Umschreibungen des genitivus comparationis. Ab with the ablative is found in Lactantius, a further indication of his African origin. Zu saeculorum. Sator saeculorum, Arnob. I, 34, supports Bücheler's derivation of saeculum from the root sa-, sow. Cf. p. 126.

W. M. Lindsay, Spuren vulgärlateinischer Betonung bei den alten Dramatikern. Words of four syllables beginning with three shorts (υυυυ) have in anapaestic metres the accent either on the penult or on the first syllable. In other metres they are almost without exception accented on the first syllable. Words of four syllables with a long initial syllable (—υυυ—) in all metres have the accent on the first or second syllable. The pronunciations muliërem, sequimîni, etc. in vulgar Latin, assumed by Gröber in Vol. I, p. 223, are not justified by a few isolated and perhaps doubtful examples.

J. Stürzinger, Sursum von surgere. Would make sursum a participle of surgere, comparing sortus from sorrectus, Festus, 279 M. Sursum could be formed from surgere, and its existence as a participle, at least in vulgar Latin, is made probable by Provençal and Old French sors.

599-623. Review of the Literature for 1890, 1891.

623-624. Necrology. O. Riemann by E. Wölfflin.

624-625. Seventh Annual Report.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM FÜR PHILOGIE, Vol. LX, Pts. 3, 4.

Pp. 321-60. Ein neuer Kämmeribericht aus Tauromenion. H. Willers. A study of an inscription found at Taormina in 1892. It must have been written between 70 and 36 B. C. Unlike the other inscriptions of this group, it reckons in νόμοι (denarii) instead of in talents. A talent = 3 nomoi = 120 litrai. From the prices of grain mentioned in the Verrine orations, the purchasing value of a νόμος (= 4 sesterces) in Tauromenion is calculated at about 2 M. 8½ in the Germany of to-day.

Pp. 361-87. Aus Vergils Dichterwerkstätte. P. Jahn. A detailed study of the sources of Virgil's matter: Varro, Aristotle, Nicander, etc. For similar studies of other portions of the Georgics, see Hermes, 1902-03; Rheinisches Museum, 1903; Philologus, 1904; Progr. d. Köllnischen Gymnasiums, 1897-99 and 1905. (P. S.—This article deals with Geor. iii. 49-470.)

Pp. 388-416. Zu Didymos' Demosthenes-Commentar. A. Körte. I. Die vierte Philippika. A defense of the genuineness of the Fourth Philippic. As Wilamowitz has suggested, it is really a political pamphlet rather than an oration. The commentary of Didymus removes some of the old difficulties (§§ 6, 32, 35-45, 70-74. II. Neue Fragmente des Timokles.

Pp. 417-24. Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Firmicus Maternus de errore. K. Ziegler.

Pp. 425-47. Inschriftliches zur Geschichte der attischen Komödie. A. Körte. A study of three Roman inscriptions, I. G. XIV 1097, 1098, 1098 a. These seem to be fragments of a long catalogue of the writers of Attic comedy, made for some Roman library under the early Empire. It may have been a copy of Callimachus' *πίναξ κατὰ χρόνους τῶν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων*.

Miscellen.—P. 448. R. J. T. Wagner. Aristoph. Ach. 23 sq. The writer would change *ἐλθόντες*, l. 24, to *εὐδουσιν*.—Pp. 449-54. H. van Herwerden. Ad novissimam Alciphronis editionem.—P. 454. H. van Herwerden. ΠΙΝΑΤΠΑΝ—ΕΙΝΑΤΠΑΝ? Suggests that in an inscription recently published from Isauria (Journ. Hellen. Stud. XXV 174) we should read, not *πίνατραν*, but *είνατραν* (= *εἰνάτεραν*, brother's wife).—Pp. 454-7. L. Ziehen. Zum Tempelgesetz von Alea.—Pp. 457-8. A. Deissmann. ΠΡΟΘΥΜΑ. In Aquila's translation of Exodus, xxiv 6, we find the expression *ἔθηκεν ἐν προθύμασιν*. Some scholars have supposed that he meant "in pateris"; but his words can only mean "verwandte zu Voropfern".—Pp. 458-9. M. Niedermann. Zur Appendix Probi (153 ed. Heraeus). For "raucus non raucus" read "raucus non [d]raucus".—Pp. 459-62. M. Niedermann. Laptuca=lactuca und Verwandtes. Discusses such forms as "consectum" for "consaepum", "suctilissimo" for "suptilissimo". *smaraldus: *smaraudus (Fr. émeraude, Prov. esmerauda); smaragdus: salma: sauma: sagma.—Pp. 462-3. E. Petersen. Pigna. The writer still maintains that the Pigna of the Vatican was not originally designed for use as a fountain (see Rh. Mus. LX 297).—Pp. 463-4. F. Jacoby. Amores. A protest against the statement of O. Crusius (Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyklopädie, V 2293) that the title "Neaera" may be inferred from Lygdamus I 6.

Prefixed to the fourth number of this volume is a brief obituary notice of Professor HERMANN USENER (Oct. 23, 1834—Oct. 21, 1905). He was a contributor to the Museum for nearly half a century, and after the death of Professor Ribbeck, in 1898, he served as one of its editors.

Pp. 465-91. Sol invictus. H. Usener. The celebration of the birth of Christ on December 25 was probably fixed to coincide with an old heathen festival "Natalis Solis Invicti". This was held at the time of the winter solstice, when the sun recommences his upward course, and is, as it were, born anew. The adaptation was the more easily effected because of the conception of Christ as the "Sun of righteousness" (Malachi, 4, 2), who had triumphed even over death. The pagan festival seems to have been introduced at Rome in the days of the Empire. In the triumph of Aurelian (274) the sun was officially recognized as the god of the court and of the Empire, but, as the Roman coins show, the oriental worship of a "Sol Invictus" had long been known in

the city. Hippolytus, the commentator on Daniel, writing about 202, and again in 222, gives the date of the Nativity as April 2. An early list of bishops (Mommsen, *Chronica minora*, I p. 70) shows that by 336 the December date was officially recognized by the Roman church, though as late as 354 the day had not been formally made a festival on that account. If we may believe Ananias of Shirak, the first official celebration of December 25, as opposed to the older joint festival of the Birth and Epiphany on January 6, was held at the court of Constantius, apparently between 354 and 360. For the statement of this Armenian scholar of the early 7th century see the *Expositor* for 1896, p. 326.

Pp. 492-504. Die metrischen Wirkungen anlautender Consonantengruppen bei Homer und Hesiod. F. Solmsen. In Homer, apart from the cases in which ν ἐφελκυστικόν may help to make position, there are 115 cases where a final short vowel in the thesis is followed by an initial consonant group. In 88 of these the vowel is treated as if long; in 27 it remains short. The usage of Hesiod agrees in all respects with that of Homer. Incidentally, the writer discusses the formation of *δαφνοῖς*, *δάσκιος*, *δασπλήτης*, *δάπεδον*.

Pp. 505-51. Die Schrift des Martinus von Bracara formula vitae honestae. E. Bickel. A long study of the language, style and matter of this treatise. The conclusion seems to be that it is an epitome of Seneca's *De Officiis*.

Pp. 552-59. Randbemerkungen (continued from p. 314). W. Kroll. Textual notes on *Dirae*, 10, 82; *Ciris*, 361; *Cicero*, *Orat.* 152; *Quintilian*, IX 4, 28, IX 4, 63, XII 10, 13, X 1, 77 (for *minoribus causis* read *vilioribus*); *Germanicus*, *Arat.* 531-64, 32; *Theodorus Priscianus*; *Manilius*, *Prooem.* to IV, 18, 27; *Prooem.* to I, 25 ff.

Pp. 560-73. *Analecta in Aetnam*. R. Hildebrandt.

Pp. 574-83. Zur Ueberlieferung des Gedichtes *Aetna*. S. Sudhaus.

Pp. 584-93. Zur Hadesmythologie. L. Radermacher. In the *Frogs*, 300, Dionysos had good reason for wishing to conceal his real name. If the *Empusa* had learned it, she might have gained power over him. In the rather late dialogue *Hermippos* (*Rh. Mus.* LII 345) we have the popular belief that if the names of the dead are changed the ghosts cannot molest them on their journey.

Pp. 595-613. Das Syntagma des Gelasius Cyzicenus. G. Loeschcke. I. Gelasius, sein Werk und seine Quellen.

Pp. 614-23. *Nixi di und Verwandtes*. O. von Basiner.

Pp. 624-29. Eine verschollene Priscianhandschrift. P. Lehmann. A 'Codex Corbeiensis' used by Franciscus Fabricius *Marcoduranus* (1527-1573).

Pp. 630-35. *Klassische Reminiscenzen*. A. Brinkmann. The beginning of the funeral oration in Thucydides, II 35, has served as a model in the story of the twelve martyrs of Gortyna. In the Sinaitic story of Galaktion (Migne 116, 93 ff) the hero's parents are named Kleitophon and Leukippe.

Miscellen.—Pp. 636-7. F. Solmsen. *Philocomasium*.—Pp. 637-9. E. Assmann. *Zu Martialis* 4, 64 (read *virgines liquore*).—Pp. 639-40. H. Schickinger. *Zu Caesar* b. G. 7, 35, 4 (read '*coartatis quidem cohortibus*').

HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE XXIX, 3, 4.

No. 3.

1. Pp. 177-201. *Studies in Plautus, Asinaria*. II. Corrections of the text. By Louis Havet. Critical discussion of about forty passages.

2. Pp. 201-204. The musical fragment of Oxyrhyncus, by C. E. Ruelle. This article would not be intelligible if much compressed. M. Ruelle rejects the assignment of the fragment to Aristoxenus.

3. Pp. 205-236. *Plautinian Metre*, by Georges Romain. This elaborate investigation, which all interested in the subject will examine in the original, is divided into three parts. I. Discussion of the weak part of the fourth foot of the iambic trimeter and the fifth of the trochaic tetrameter (the corresponding half-foot). II. Critical discussion of passages containing archaisms (*siem*, *possem*, *duim*, *fuas*, *nevis*, *danunt*, etc.) in the foot named. III. Discussion of the *proceleusmaticus*.

4. Pp. 237-272. *Inscriptions of Didyma*. Accounts of the construction of the temple. By B. Haussoullier. This interesting article discusses, among other things, a long inscription in which is incorporated a financial account of part of the construction.

5. Pp. 273-276. *Book Notices*. 1. F. Solmsen. *Inscriptiones Graecae ad illustrandas dialectos selectae*. Leipzig, 1903. B. Haussoullier, regretting a few defects, finds this work on the whole useful and recommends it to French Hellenists. 2. Otto Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, Zweite Aufl. Berlin, 1905. Reviewed by Victor Chapot, who describes the work and considers it so important that he hopes it will soon be translated into French. He finds one objection to the execution of the work: the failure to arrange and classify clearly and give headings of the various topics.

No. 4.

1. Pp. 277-288. The use of the diminutive in Catullus, by P. de Labriolle. Rejecting the view that Catullus employed the

diminutive simply because he was "fond of it" or for metrical reasons, and at the same time disavowing any theory that it was *always* used for stylistic effect (since not a few diminutives had ceased to be felt as such), the author enumerates the examples and classifies the uses according to the effects intended. [The conclusions he reaches are for the most part what, it seems to me, any one who has often read Catullus must feel to be correct.]

2. Pp. 289-291. Theocritus as imitator of Sophron, by Edmond Faral. Starting out with the remark of the scholiast in the argument of Id. II of Theocritus, that *τὴν Θεστυλίδαν ὁ Θεόκριτος ἀπειροκάλως ἐκ τῶν Σώφρονος μετήνεγκε μίμων*, and his remark at v. 10 that certain things were taken from Sophron (MSS *εὐφορίωνος*), the author finds some striking resemblances between this Idyl and the fragments of Sophron.

3. Pp. 291-292. Anchurus, by P. Roussel. This interesting note clearly demonstrates that in Anth. Pal. XV, 25 (Dübner, II, p. 509) v. 7, for *ταγχύρου* we should read *Ἀγχούρου*. This Anchurus was the son of Midas, and how it came about that he was identified with gold is fully explained by M. Roussel.

4. Pp. 293-295. *Κέλμης ἐν σιδήρῳ*, by P. Roussel. This is an interesting explanation of the proverb: *Κέλμης ἐν σιδήρῳ ἐπὶ τῶν σφόδρα ἑαυτοῖς πιστευσάντων*.

5. Pp. 296-305. Apropos of a correction by Scaliger of Tibullus I. 2. 65, 66, by A. Cartault. The correction consists in changing "fuit" into "fuat", a correction ungenerously characterized as "méthodique une fois par hasard." The discussion of this passage leads the author to an interesting investigation of several other questions relating to Tibullus.

6. Pp. 306-309. De carmine quod est inter Horatiana 4. 8, by Mortimer Lamson Earle. This article is devoted to the support of those that consider this ode spurious. It consists largely of citations of passages in Horace that seem to be imitated in this ode.

7. Pp. 309-314. The origin of the name of Phoenicia, by Isidore Lévy. The Greek origin as well as all previous explanations of the name are rejected, and it is pointed out that the early name of Caria must have been *Φοινίκη*. How the name was, so to speak, pushed around to the eastern end of the sea is also explained and illustrated by analogous cases. No attempt, however, is made to explain the word itself.

8. Pp. 315-318. Critical discussion of Plaut. Mil. 435-439 and Truc. 826-831, by Félix Gaffiot.

9. Pp. 319-320. *Κρόνου* or *Ἥλιου ἀστήρ* (Epinomis 987 C)? by J. Bidez. It is shown that the designation *Ἥλιου ἀστήρ* to denote the planet Saturn was employed sometimes, and that the preference should be given to *Ἥλιου* in the Epinomis, supported as it is by A (Parisinus 1807).

10. Pp. 321-327. Psellus and the commentary on Plato's *Timaeus* by Proclus, by J. Bidez. This interesting article shows that Psellus copied Proclus so closely that his work can be utilized in constituting the text of the latter.

11. Pp. 328-333. Three critical notes on Minucius Felix's *Octavius*, 1) on three passages by F. Préchac, 2) on one passage by P. Médan, 3) on two passages by J. de Decker.

12. Pp. 334-336. *De titulo Ionico*, by Bruno Keil. Critical discussion of a short inscription published by Haussoullier, *Ofrande à Apollon Didyméen*, Chalon-sur-Saône, 1905.

13. Pp. 337-346. Book Notices. 1. Hermann Reich. *Der Mann mit dem Eselskopf*.—Separatabdruck aus dem Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare Gesellschaft (XIV Jahrg.). Weimar, 1904. A. Grenier commends this work, which traces the history of the (theatrical) man changed into an ass from the first century to Shakespeare, and suggests that the same character should be traced from a much earlier period, even from the Mycenaean age. 2. Attilio de Marchi, *Il culto privato di Roma antica. La religione gentilizia e collegiale*. Milan, 1903. Ch. Dubois gives a very appreciative account of this work with some slight reservations. 3. Ch. Dubois calls attention to "A Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions" by N. Olcott, in course of publication. 4. G. Wissowa, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte*. München, 1904. Ch. Dubois, pronouncing it a happy idea of Wissowa to collect and publish his various remarkable articles on Roman religion, adds a list of titles of the fifteen articles. 5. Fr. X. Burger. *Minucius Felix und Seneca*. München, 1904. J. de Decker regards this work as exhausting the subject and furnishing a complete repertoire of all the relations of Minucius Felix to Seneca.

The *Revue des Revues*, begun in a previous number, is completed in this number.

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

BRIEF MENTION.

Many years ago I wrote for my own amusement a little essay intended to ridicule the mania for hunting up plagiarisms; and I used a couple of sentences from it in the Introduction to my Persius xxiii, in connexion with Persius' supposed borrowings from Horace. Among the mock examples adduced was one from Macaulay's Lays of Ancient Rome, and I charged that *vir immortalis memoriae* with cribbing part of the familiar line, 'And now, mine own dear little girl, there is no way but this', from Twelfth Night, Act III, Sc. 2, where Fabian says: 'There is no way but this, Sir Andrew'. Imagine then my surprise at finding after all these years in Mr. SHARPLEY's edition of *Aristophanes' Peace* (Edinburgh, Blackwood) the following note on v. 110: οὐκ ἔστι παρὰ ταῦτ' ἄλλ': 'A colloquial phrase *not* equivalent to the high sounding "There is no way but this"'. Now, old experience has taught me that an underscored *not* means a stab at a rival editor (A. J. P. XIV 499), and sure enough, I find that Mr. SHARPLEY is hitting at what he considers a peccant translation in Merry's edition. But what could be more colloquial than 'there is no way but this'? The 'high sound' is due to Mr. SHARPLEY's association of the phrase with Macaulay's ballad, and the Rector of Lincoln, who has an established reputation as a sympathetic editor of Aristophanes (A. J. P. XXI 229), must have been as much amused at the criticism as I am. But Aristophanes is the dear delight of every Greek scholar, and as every new edition sets me to reading him again, I am going to forgive Mr. SHARPLEY for a number of things that happen to be particularly irritating to an old stager. The genesis of a book, for instance, is a matter of supreme interest to the author, who is prone to take the public into his confidence, as if the public were the happy party of the other part in the procreative process, whereas the public cares for nothing except the finished product, unless perchance the author has reached autobiographical rank, as in the case of Gibbon's Decline and Fall, as in the case of Goethe's Faust. There was no woe upon Mr. SHARPLEY to edit the *Peace* before he consulted Mr. Rogers' 'famous work', and if Mr. SHARPLEY had been a serious editor, and thought the book essential to the proper preparation of his edition, he might have walked from Hertford to London, and got a green ticket at the British Museum. What a striking contrast is this way of doing things to what we read of that admirable scholar, whose loss we have lately been called upon to deplore. WENDLAND tells us in his sketch of Usener, in the December number of the

Preussische Jahrbücher, how in order to have a complete set of Bernays' essays that great scholar copied them out with his own hand; and similar stories are told of other professional philologists. Then again, Mr. SHARPLEY informs the world that 'owing to a personal dislike which <he> is not prepared to defend, the asterisk and the obelus have not been used in the text'. All this self-consciousness, all this wilfulness would not be tolerable even in a scholar of the highest rank, but unfortunately Mr. SHARPLEY has a great deal of company in this sort of thing, as I have been compelled to note in so many highly dispensable school editions. The same airiness, the same careless manner of handling his subject is, I am sorry to say, discernible in another performance of Mr. SHARPLEY's, which has just come to hand, a translation of the *Mimes of Herodas* (London, Nutt), in which he ignores Symonds's translations of the *Mimes*, to which I called attention in my review of Mr. NAIRN's edition (A. J. P. XXV 228). By the way Mr. SHARPLEY accepts the ellipsis of κύλικος in I 25, and translates πέπωκεν ἐκ καινῆς in a stilted fashion that reminds one of the eighteenth century, 'and drained the honeyed cup of love anew'. Symonds's 'has drunk at fresh fountains' is much more natural, even if κύλικος be the more plausible ellipsis.

'Cupio me esse clementem', though it is hard work sometimes, and I am aware that the kind of flicking criticism, in which I indulge, is not altogether fair. A book may have a positive value as a whole, in spite of grave errors in detail; and the few additional remarks that I shall make, will be at least a tribute to the suggestiveness of Mr. SHARPLEY's commentary. It is something in these days to be even suggestive. On v. 32 he says: 'A great deal has been made of the fact that the collocation τέως ἔως is not found elsewhere in Attic. But it would not be found here, if the speaker were not dwelling on the curse and shaking his fist'. From which we deduce the rule, 'when one dwells on a curse and shakes one's fist, τέως ἔως is in order', a rule which may be commended to the attention of the psychological syntactician. At first, this assumption of superior insight into the mind of a master is annoying. It might be well enough in St. Paul on a ticklish theme (I Cor. 7, 40), but we are hardly prepared to accept Mr. SHARPLEY's unsupported dictum. The area of impressionism is large enough, and he who reduces it does a service, and so I will allow myself to attack this problem in another way. To me the matter is simple enough. Everybody knows that the expression of correlation gives a certain deliberateness to style. So πρότερον—πρίν (A. J. P. II 483). So οὕτω—ὥστε (A. J. P. XIV 240). Aristophanes seldom uses οὕτω with ὥστε, and in the whole range of the language τέως—ἔως are seldom found in correlation. The combination is 'as formal as a lawsuit'

(A. J. P. XXIII 256), and the juxtaposition here gives the line a certain grimness which is better expressed in my judgment by a setting or gritting of the teeth than by a shaking of the fist, especially when one remembers what may be called the 'episiktic' effect of the double sigma. In the same verse I am quite in accord with the reading *λάβοις* (A. J. P. XXI 231), and as I have not much reverence for the author of Dawes's canon, I should not have felt myself bound to cite his emendation, *ἔως σεαυτὸν ἂν λάθῃς* but *ἔως σεαυτὸν ἂν λάθῃς* is not an 'impossibility', unless we can get rid of Ran. 259: *ὅποσον ἢ φάρυγξ ἂν ἡμῶν | χανδάνῃ δι' ἡμέρας*, where even Blaydes stares and gasps but submits. See also S. C. G. § 466.

It happens to every commentator, I suppose, to overlook a grammatical point when it first occurs in his author, so that the note is not made at the right place, and I will not quarrel with Mr. SHARPLEY for postponing his remark on *πόθεν ἂν* with optative (v. 20), until he comes to v. 521, where he recognizes the wishing character of *πόθεν ἂν*. But the oversight is all the more remarkable, because it is this equivalence to the pure optative in v. 20 that gives the only sensible explanation of the negative *μή* which he passes over dryshod (A. J. P. XXI 231). In the note on v. 59: *μή κκόρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα*, we are informed with magisterial impressiveness that the sense of 'deflower' is wholly irrelevant. But who wants relevancy in the *verkehrte Welt* of comedy? We shall be told next that the Pisthetairos' threat to Iris in the Birds is irrelevant. He ought to have threatened to clip her wings (Av. 1254). —v. 71: *ξυνετριβὴ τῆς κεφαλῆς*. Mr. SHARPLEY calls *τῆς κεφαλῆς* 'the old undifferentiated local genitive, it cannot be classed under the partitive'. Here again we have a fling at Dr. Merry, who calls it a partitive genitive as do most of the grammarians. If by undifferentiated local genitive, Mr. SHARPLEY means an original genitive that has elsewhere crystallized into a local sense, he may be right, but he has not expressed himself clearly, and it might be well for him to heed the advice of Dionysos: *ἀμαθέστερόν πως εἰπὲ καὶ σαφέστερον*. —In v. 241 *ὁ κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν* is explained 'in accordance with a suggestion of Mr. J. C. Miles' as *ὁ κ. τ. σ. χέζειν ποιῶν*. But why not cite M. MAZON, who says: 'Le scholiaste sous-entend avec raison *τιλᾶν ποιῶν*. En même temps, Trygée s'accroupit comme Dionysos (Ran. 308, 479). L'expression, obscure pour un lecteur, était fort claire pour un spectateur'. I am not convinced. Nor can I see that 'Mr. Miles's' theory is supported by Lys. 1257: *πολύς δ' ἀμᾶ καττῶν σκελῶν [ἀφρός] ἔστα*. Of course, 'sweat' might be used euphemistically (Ran. 237), but here *ἀφρός* must be taken literally, as is shown by *ἀμφὶ τὰς γένους*. —On *κατὰ τοῖν σκελοῖν* I said my say long ago, A. J. P. XI 372. —v. 323: *διὰ τὰ σχήματα* is not 'for the sake of your antics' but 'thanks to your antics'. The chorus does not intend to do

any harm (A. J. P. XI 372). It is not the same thing as ὑπὸ τῶν σχημάτων, Eur. Cycl. 220, which Mr. SHARPLEY has quoted. That is the ὑπό of accompaniment.—v. 1076: πρίν κεν . . . ὑμεναιοῖ. 'As a matter of fact', Mr. SHARPLEY says, 'Homer never adds κεν or ἄν to πρίν with subjunctive'. He might have added that as a matter of fact, Homer never uses the present subjunctive with the conjunction πρίν. But ὑμεναιοῖ is optative, not subjunctive, and πρίν is the adverb, and Aristophanes was a better Homeric scholar than is Mr. SHARPLEY. Why the editors are so superstitious as not to punctuate differently, I cannot divine. Certain it is that the Latin translation in Blaydes would have saved Mr. SHARPLEY. πρίν is rendered *ante* not *antequam*.—The proof-reading is not faultless. v. 524 'homoeoarchon' for 'homoeoarkton' ought not to have escaped a fairly vigilant eye, and v. 603 we read of an 'epirrhematizing choryphaeus'.—v. 549 'bamboozle' should be spelled with a *u*, if the point is not to be broken off, but while Mr. SHARPLEY has not incurred what Balzac calls 'le dangier d'estre trop cocquebin', he prefers to hint at improprieties rather than to bring them out with antique candor. See f. i. his note on v. 712: βληχωνίαν. For 'depositious' (ἀποβολιμαῖος), v. 678 read 'depositious' to match 'supposititious' (ὑποβολιμαῖος).

Mr. SHARPLEY's note on πρίν, to which I have just referred, is a sad reminder that after all that has been done to clear up the use of πρίν, its genesis and its use, there is a good deal of haze about the edges still. The practical formula which I published nearly thirty years ago,¹ Just. Mart. Apol. I 4, 13, abides for all the Greek that the average student is likely to encounter, and yet it has not won its way to universal acceptance. πρίν with the aoristic (apobatic) tenses is the type. Why the aoristic tenses is clear enough, as clear as the aorist indicative with οὕτω, as clear as the aorist with ἕως 'until'. Establish a type and it works automatically, thanks to what Ouvre calls 'la grande endormeuse de la pensée, l'habitude' (A. J. P. VIII 230). The only thing that really concerns the syntactician is the exceptional use of πρίν with the durative tenses (A. J. P. II 477). Present infinitive and present subjunctive shew that reflection is at work, that there is a distinct notion of a process, of overlapping. One illustration among many. In Plato's Theaet. 166 B we read δοκεῖς τινα . . . δώσειν ποτὲ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνομοιούμενον τῷ πρὶν ἀνομοιοῦσθαι ὄντι; In the Symp. 208 B in which Diotima describes the same process, she says: τὸ θνητὸν σφύζεται . . . τῷ τὸ ἀπὸν καὶ παλαιούμενον ἕτερον νέον ἐγκαταλείπειν οἷον αὐτὸ ἦν, where Hug thinks that the overlapping of the participle deserves a note; and so Plato, or Plato's puppet,

¹(1) When πρίν *must* be translated 'before' it *must* have the infinitive.
(2) When it *may* be translated 'until' it *may* take the finite constructions of ἕως 'until'. Exceptions are found in Iss. and later Greek.

Protagoras, seems to think that *πρὶν ἀνομοιοῦσθαι* deserves a note, for he breaks up the verb afterwards into its constituent parts, and makes sneering use of the periphrasis *ἐάνπερ ἀνομοιώσις γίγνηται*, so as to satisfy the carpers, the *ὀνομάτων θηρευταί*, who wish to make everything turn on *εἶναι* and *γίγνεσθαι*. Another example of overlapping is found Ar. Pax 85, this time in the subjunctive (A. J. P. II 481): *πρὶν ἂν ἰδίῃς καὶ διαλύῃς*, where some excellent scholars, following the scholiast's *ἰδρώῃς*, read *ἰδίῃς*. The scholiasts are not always to be followed in the matter of tenses, and in v. 87 as Sobolewski notes, Synt. Ar. p. 144 (cf. A. J. P. XIII 501), with the later preference for the aorist, translate *μὴ πνεῖ* by *μὴ βδέῃς* just as Schol. ζ 5 commenting on *πίνε* says: *ἀντὶ τοῦ πίνει*. M. MAZON, in his recent edition, who says that the verse will not scan and cites v. 204, forgets Ran. 237, where *ἰδέει* is likely, if not certain. Tr. 'ere you begin to sweat (not 'break out into a sweat'), and so supple the sinews of your limbs' (*ἰδίων διαλύῃς*).

Professor GOODWIN's edition of the *Midiana of Demosthenes* (Cambridge University Press) will at once command respectful attention. In knowledge of the history of the period, in knowledge of the minutiae of Attic legal proceedings he has few rivals. And then Demosthenes is his special province, and Professor GOODWIN's style ordinarily sober, as befits a grammarian of his school, never rises so high as when he pleads for Demosthenes, the patriot, Demosthenes, the champion of a lost cause. Some of us who have championed lost causes are not so enthusiastic about other people's lost causes and are tempted to subscribe to Nietzsche and to accept Philip as an 'Uebermensch'. At all events, I am not ashamed to confess that my interest in Demosthenes is largely of the aesthetic order. But the interest is keen enough, though it is haply quickened by sundry frank utterances on the part of other scholars. Koch, the grammarian, evidently cannot abide Demosthenes (A. J. P. XIV 106) and Demosthenes was evidently antipathetic to Ivo Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356). I only wish there were more people to speak their minds freely about the heroes of classical literature, as did the Scaligers and the Casaubons of an earlier day. Demosthenes was a bit of a blackguard and offends the conventional soul of to-day as Isokrates does not. But I have long since exhausted my resources of indignation at the naughtinesses of the ancients, and I am not distressed at Demosthenes' lack of refinement, as Professor GOODWIN is, any more than I take it to heart when I read how the great and good George Washington swore like the trooper that he was, and how he belaboured his cowardly colonels in the streets of New York with his cane and not with the orthodox flat of his sword. Demosthenes, as is well known, outswears all the Attic orators and is not overparticular about the shape of the

cudgel with which he breaks his enemies' heads. ὦ μισὰ κεφαλὴ and the familiar imperative ὅπως c. fut. ind. (A. J. P. VI 60) take one back to Aristophanes again (A. J. P. IV 440). Once in the swing of his oratory I give myself up to him but I do not lose my head for all that, and when the whirl is over, and the flush wears off, I come back to study the secrets of his art, or shall I say? the tricks of his trade, the skilful use of rhetorical figures, the effective position of his words, the recurrent crack of the whip, the sting in the tail of his sentences, the *staccato* passages and the *legato* passages, and the wonderful rhythms. To me as a syntactician, his use of the participle, his use of the articular infinitive speaks volumes. After he exhausts his stock of adjectives, he takes to the participle, e. g. 21, 114: ἀσεβῆς καὶ μισρὸς καὶ πᾶν ἂν ὑποστᾶς. After he exhausts his stock of abstract nouns he resorts to the articular infinitive, e. g. 21, 96: παρὰ τὴν πενίαν καὶ ἐρημίαν καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν εἰς εἶναι. It was as a syntactician that I spoke when I said some years ago at Chicago that I wished I could induce some of my audience 'to listen to the long roar of the wave that sweeps the wreckage of a world on the shore or to watch the Titanic orator as he hurls, first one smooth stone after the other at his foe, and then when ammunition fails, gathers up in his mighty grasp the loose substance of the earth, balls it into a weighty mass and brings it crashing on his adversary's head'. There is something of the Megaera in this Βάταλος, something feminine in his fury, something that recalls the Corcyraean women of Thukydides 3, 74: βάλλουσαι ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκιῶν τῷ κεράμῳ. He fights at times, as it were, with clods and fence-rails, and yet it is all planned, and these apparently extemporized weapons are as much a part of his armory as the Chalkidian blades of Alkaios were a part of the armory of the warrior poet of Lesbos. Cf. 21, 191: ἐγὼ δ' ἐσκέφθαι μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, φημί καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀρνηθεῖν καὶ μεμελετηκέναι γ' ὥς ἐνὴν μάλιστ' ἐμοί. And the preciousness of this very *Midiana* lies in the fact that we are inducted into the orator's workshop, that we see all this in the making. The roughnesses of the *Midiana*, its turbulence at which Professor GOODWIN waxes impatient at times, these things are valuable documents to him who is concerned with the artistic process.

In Professor GOODWIN'S *Midiana* syntactical matters are usually despatched by a reference to the editor's *Moods and Tenses*, so far as they fall within the scope of that authoritative manual. Very few of the points made admit discussion, and most of them seem to be rather elementary for the stage that a student is supposed to have reached who is ripe enough for the *Midiana*, which is at a long remove from Xenophon's *Anabasis* (A. J. P. XXV 227). But of the limits of syntactical annotation a professed syntactician is hardly a judge, and Professor GOOD-

WIN is pardonable in yielding to the strong temptation to shew how well his *Moods and Tenses* responds to every emergency that he recognizes. And any suggestion that he is too much given to M. T.'s would come with an ill grace from one who is equally given to A. J. P.'s. One knows one's own wisdom so well and so often forgets the source. At least I do—and besides, who has the time to hunt up Matthiä and Bernhardt and Rost and Kühner and Krüger and Madvig and Bäumlein and Aken and all the rest to whose stores of facts and observations we Epigoni have not added so much after all (A. J. P. XXV 111). As WILAMOWITZ says in the preface to his *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* IX 'Mir liegt gar nichts daran, ob ich die Wahrheit zuerst sage: ich bin Platoniker und denke nur an den λόγος, nicht an die λέγοντες'. But if one reads himself too much there is great danger of narrowing the vision, of overlooking points that are not made by the syntax with which one is most familiar; and in one of his notes Professor GOODWIN has slurred a distinction that seems to be of some importance. 21, 159 reads: οὐ δεῖ δὴ . . . τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐκ τούτων κρίνειν, εἴ τις οἰκοδομεῖ λαμπρῶς ἢ θεραπαίνας κέκτηται πολλὰς ἢ σκευὴ ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν ἐν τούτοις λαμπρὸς καὶ φιλότιμος ᾗ ὧν ἅπασι μέτεστι τοῖς πολλοῖς ὑμῶν. Whereupon Professor GOODWIN: 'A sudden change from εἴ τις οἰκοδομεῖ. The general relative conditional with ὅς ἂν and the subjunctive and the corresponding protasis with εἰ ἂν are often practically equivalent; and the indicative without ἂν may be used in both without an essential change of force'. But there is an essential change of force. εἴ τις, as I pointed out in 1876, and repeatedly since (Tr. A. Phil. Asso., 1876, p. 2, A. J. P. III 435, Pindar I. E. cvii, S. C. G. § 365) is a 'double ender' (A. J. P. XIX 343). It may be particular, it may be generic. It is the very form for personal argument, for a general cap that fits a particular head. εἴ τις is Meidias, ὅς ἂν any praiseworthy creature, not to say Demosthenes himself; that would be immodest. In short, Demosthenes is punching Meidias as Meidias punched Demosthenes. Temporal syntax of which Professor ADAMS has made a special feature in his *Lysias* (American Book Company) does not fare so well as modal syntax. Professor ADAMS would not have failed to recognize the force of the negated imperfect § 90: οὐκ ἀπῆντα, nor would he have translated § 157 ἐγενόμην 'was made' where it is simply the aorist of εἰμί with definite numbers as in D. 38, 12, Thuk. 5, 26, Ar. Eccl. 277. I am afraid to touch on οὐχ ὅπως (§ 11) again (A. J. P. XXII 228), but an ellipsis of λέγω with ὅπως has never satisfied me. How often is a verb of saying used with ὅπως and how? It is not certain that ὅπως follows ὅτι blindly, and, in fact, any ellipsis is unsafe. There is, however, a suggestion of οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως. The rhythm of § 149 as well as the language points to a poetical semi-quotation: καὶ τίς οὐκ οἶδεν ὑμῶν τὰς ἀπορρήτους—ὥσπερ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ—[τὰς] τούτου γονάς. Cf. Ar. Eccl. 3 (paratr.): γονάς τε γὰρ σὰς καὶ τύχας δηλώσομεν. A student who needs a note on ἐπειδάν and ὅταν (§ 34) would surely need a note here, to reinforce Demosthenes' ὥσπερ ἐν τραγῳδίᾳ.

No more striking sign of the times than the publication of a Latin Phonetic, *Phonétique historique du Latin* (Paris, Klincksieck), for which a distinguished master of linguistic science, M. MEILLET, stands sponsor, and in which the author, M. NIEDERMANN, frankly discards all reference to Greek, as a language unknown to the majority of young Latin students, and cursed with an alphabet almost equally unknown. That is the passing of Greek with a vengeance. Not so much as the alphabet left. Some day the mathematicians will discard π , and if the *caret* mark \wedge remains, it will be because the world has forgotten that it stands for *λείπει*, and looks upon it simply as an entering wedge. Is Greek after all a 'drunken cloud' that has sailed over and is gone? Is it a mere shape that Zeus has conjured up to fool Ixion? But your 'robust and brass-bound man' has no fear. His cloud like Shelley's cloud is the daughter of earth and water, but *ἕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένεσθε* has no terrors for him.

I am the daughter of earth and water,
The offspring of the sky;
I pass through the pores of ocean and shores,
I change but I never die.

Now there are those who contend that unless Greek change, it must die, that the argument of which we heard so much some years ago, that the truest as well as the easiest way to ancient Greek is through the modern tongue will not hold, that the 'lingo' we find in Greek books and newspapers and letters is a sham, and that the German compounds and the French syntax must give way to something truly alive. Greece itself is divided into two camps and the names of the protagonists, Hatzidakis and Psicharis (Psichari) are familiar even to those who know nothing of the great scholar and the brilliant *littérateur*. The controversy has borne bloody fruit, and some have even dared to die for the maintenance of the old tongue. In this battle of Bianchi and Neri I have neither the desire nor the equipment to engage, and my sympathies are somewhat divided. Every Greek scholar, who visits Greece and finds himself helpless when it comes to intercourse with the people, tries to get some comfort or at least some amusement out of the situation, as he contrasts the vocables that figure in the grammar with the words he hears in the street, and the artificial language of the signs that seem to have been contrived to delude the foreign Hellenist with the actual speech of muleteer and sailor. He jots down in his note-book the various forms that such a familiar name as *Οἰκονόμος* assumes in the *sgraffiti* of Athens—and smiles. And yet there is another side and a very practical side. No study, it is true, more interesting to the student of linguistics than the dialects of modern Greece, but there are few more complicated, and who has the time to wait

until the new and living tongue is born? Who would not miss such a means of intercommunication as the newspaper Greek of to-day? Artificial, it may be, but it lends itself wonderfully to the exigencies of modern life, and the style is not always the non-conductor that the Germans have been calling of late years the 'paper style'. In the hands of such a master as Bikélas, Modern Greek of the bookish pattern can yield the same thrill as any 'living' speech. All modern languages are more or less artificial. When the veriest rustic takes pen in hand, he leaves speech aside. All book English is to a certain extent unreal. If I cannot make out the jokes in the comic journals of Athens, I find it difficult to make out the jokes of some American newspapers that vie with one another in reproducing the slang of a world that is almost as strange to me as the abodes of the multiform dialects that Thumb has sampled.¹ But under the fresh impression of my visit to Greece ten years ago,² I recorded some of the thoughts that arose in me on this subject, and I recall them here merely to give a place in *Brief Mention* to the recent work of HATZIDAKIS, *Die Sprachfrage in Griechenland* (Athens, Carl Beck), written for the benefit of Western Europeans in a language that in Greece, as elsewhere, has come to the front as the language of technical scholarship. In this treatise the reader will find set forth in brief compass and with the cogency of an acknowledged master the contentions of the conservatives—which are these—(1) The formation and maintenance of the Modern Greek written language, for all these centuries down to the present day, is a natural consequence of the history of the highly conservative language of the Greeks, and their long, continuous and peculiar culture. (2) The language is not dead, nor are the many apparently antiquarian elements dead, as has often been maintained after the analogies of other languages.

¹ See B. I. Wheeler, A. J. P. XVIII 119 foll.

² 'In the perpetual struggle between the waking tongue of the people and the dormant language of the books, the school is on the side of the sleeping beauty—one dare not call it the dead language; and while the passionate insistence that it is not dead but sleepeth, will not recall the past to life, still it is impossible for the classical scholar not to feel touched when the patriotic archaizer apostrophizes the ancient tongue in the language of the disciple: 'To whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life'. The modern tongue is too restricted, too carnal in its range. To expatiate on moral or aesthetic themes in the language of the Klephts does not seem feasible; and in the to and fro of this struggle the school is a great power. Theoretically we may ask, why not let the old language die the death? Why not abolish the old alphabet, introduce phonetic spelling throughout, and let things take their course? The processes are very much such as the Romance languages have passed through. There would doubtless emerge from the caldron, in which the disjointed language simmers, a new and beautiful creation. But it is impossible to reason thus with the archaizer. So long as the language of the people receives the grafts that are made on it from the old stock, so long as the dead tree revives at the scent of the waters of Castaly and Pieria, so long the archaizer will not lose courage' (A Spartan School, in the Atlantic Monthly for May, 1897.)

(3) It is absolutely impossible for the Greeks to throw this written language overboard, and to create another in its stead. And this third point is the practical point to which one always comes back.

K. F. S.: DR. HUSSEY has the distinction of being the author of the first *Handbook of Latin Homonyms* (Boston, Sanborn and Co., 1905), which has ever been published. The field examined is confined for the most part to the actual usage of those authors who are read in the schools and the list of homonyms, which is arranged alphabetically, is preceded by an introduction in which the author explains his work and gives an interesting account of the subject in general.

It is surprising that a phenomenon of such importance should have been so long ignored. Synonyms, words of the same meaning but of different form, have never lacked attention since the days of the Stoics. Homonyms, on the contrary, words of the same form but of different meaning, have been adequately treated only by the French.

Homonyms may be homophonic or merely homographic. The homophone is the father of the pun and in Latin the rarity of the one accounts for the scarcity of the other. The few puns evolved by the Roman mind between the time of Plautus and of Priscian were often repeated and, for the most part, have been carefully recorded. The homograph is much more common although, as a rule, it offers no practical difficulty except to the beginner.

But a book of homonyms is not intended as a 'Punster's Vademecum' nor is its usefulness exhausted by those who have not yet passed the stage of linguistic attainment represented by the man who ordered a carriage 'à deux cheveux' or who took 'riz de veau à la financière' to mean 'the laugh of the calf at the banker's wife.' On the contrary this book is the nucleus of a work which ought to be indispensable to the advanced scholar. For example, the 'silences of language' are as important to know as they are difficult to discover. DR. HUSSEY himself says that what an author avoids is almost as instructive as what he chooses. I venture to add that in the study of style silence is often quite as instructive as speech. As an interpreter of silence a complete list of homonyms and of their occurrence would undoubtedly be of the greatest possible value, and it is to be hoped that DR. HUSSEY will sometime complete the work which he has so well begun.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 11 E. 17th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Demosthenes. Demosthenes' Against Midias; with critical and explanatory notes and an appendix by W. Watson Goodwin. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 7+188 pp. 8°, cl., \$2.25 net.

Horace. With explanatory notes and a table of metres by Thomas Chase; rev. by Francis H. Lee. New York, *Hinds, Noble & Eldredge*, 1905. 458 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.10.

Phillimore (J. S.) Index verborum Propertianus. New York, *Oxford University Press* (American Branch), 1906. 4+111 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.50.

Plato. Selections from Plato; with introd. and notes by L. L. Forman. New ed. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 60+510 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.90 net.

— The Theaetetus and Philebus of Plato; tr. and explained by H. F. Carlill. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 25+202 pp. 12°, cl., \$1 net.

Plutarch's Lives. Alexander, Pericles, Caius Caesar, Aemilius Paulus; tr. by W. R. Frazer. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 263 pp. 12°, cl., \$1 net.

— Plutarch's Lives; tr. from the Greek by Aubrey Stewart and G. Long. v. 1. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 21+463 pp. 12°, cl., 80 c.; leath., \$1.25.

Sophocles. The Philoctetes of Sophocles; with a commentary abridged from the Larger ed. of Sir R. Jebb. New York, *Macmillan*, 1906. 43+228 pp. 12°, cl., \$1 net.

Winternitz (Moriz) and Keith (A. B.) Catalogue of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. v. 2, with a preface by E. W. B. Nicholson. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1905. 26+350 pp. 4°, cl., 8.35 net.

ENGLISH.

Bryant (A. E.) Zulu-English Dictionary. London, 1906. 8°. 390 pp. £1 5s.

Decharme (P.) Euripides and the Spirit of his Dramas. London, 1906. 8°. 12s. 6d.

Mills (L. H.) Zarathushtra, Philo, the Achaemenids and Israel. Oxford and Leipzig, 1905/6. 8°. 460 pp. 12s.

Shuckburgh (E. S.) Greece from Coming of Hellenes to A. D. 14. London, 1906. 8°. 436 pp. 5s.

Stati (P. Papini) Thebais et Achilleis. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit H. W. Garrod. Oxford, 1906. 8°. XII, 395 pp. 5s.

FRENCH.

Bacha (E.) *Le génie de Tacite. La création des Annales.* Bruxelles, 1906. 12°. 323 pp. 4 fr.

Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes, auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae. Tom. III. Fasc. 5. Curavit R. Cagnat. Auxiliante G. Lafaye. (489-560 pp). Lex. 8°. Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1906. 2 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer, philologische. Hrsg. v. Rich. Förster. IX. Bd. gr. 8. Breslau, M. & H. Marcus. 3. Heft. Linde (Paul). *De Epicuri vocabulis ab optima Atthide alienis.* (58 S.) 1906. m. 2.

Aischylos' Choephoren. Erklärende Ausg. v. Frdr. Blass. (v, 205 S.) gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*, 1906. m. 5.

Ballhorn (Frdr.) *Alphabete orientalischer u. occidentalischer Sprachen.* 14. unveränd. (anastat.) Abdr. der Aufl. (80 S.) gr. 8°. Würzburg, *Ballhorn & Cramer* Nachf., 1906. m. 4.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, hrsg. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. V. Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 45.—5. Heft. Macmillan (K. D.) *Some Cuneiform tablets bearing on the religion of Babylonia and Assyria.* Nebst e. Abhandlg. üb. die Partikel -ma im Babylonisch-Assyrischen v. A. Ungnad. (ii u. S. 531-716). 1906. m. 11.

Corpus inscriptionum latinarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum. Vol. XIII, partis III fasc. II. gr. 4°. Berlin, *G. Reimer.* Vol. XIII. *Inscriptiones trium Galliarum et Germaniarum latinae. Instrumentum domesticum.* Collegerunt O. Hirschfeld, C. Zange-meister, O. Bohn. Ed. Osc. Bohn. Partis 3 fasc. II. *Insunt signacula medicorum oculariorum.* Ed. Aemil. Espérandiev. (S. 431-773.) 1906. m. 32.

Dessau (Herm.) *Inscriptiones latinae selectae.* Edidit D. Vol. II. Pars II. (iv u. S. 737-1040.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1906. m. 10.

Dionysi Halicarnasensis antiquitatum romanarum quae supersunt ed. Carol. Jacoby. Vol. IV. (xii, 336 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 4.

Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XVII. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer.* Pars I. Melcher (Paul). *De sermone Epicteteo quibus rebus ab attica regula discedat.* (113 S.) 1906. m. 2.80.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung m. besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte u. Methodik der einzelnen Disziplinen. Hrsg. von Prof. Dr. Iwan v. Müller. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck.* 29. u. 30. Halbbd. V. Bd. 2 Abtlg. 2. Hälfte, 3. Lfg. Gruppe, Gymn.-Prof. Dr. O.: *Griechische Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte.* (1. Bd. xiv u. S. 718 a—f u. 2. Bd. viii u. S. 1153-1923.) 1906. m. 15.

Heinrich v. Freiberg. Mit Einleitgn. üb. Stil, Sprache, Metrik, Quellen u. d. Persönlichkeit des Dichters hrsg. v. Dr. Alois Bernt. Mit 1 Lichtdr.-Beilage. (viii, 272 S.) gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*, 1906. m. 12.

Homeri Iliadis pictae fragmenta Ambrosiana. Phototypice ed. cura DD. Ant. M. Ceriani et Ach. Ratti. Praefatus est Ant. M. Ceriani. (104 Taf. m. VII, 45 S. Text.) qu. gr. 8° Mailand, *U. Hoepli*, 1905. m. 80.

Inscriptiones graecae ad inlustrandas dialectos selectae. Scholarum in usum iterum ed. Fel. Solmsen. (viii, 96 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1905. m. 2.

Libanii opera. Recensuit Rich. Foerster. Vol. III. Orationes XXVI-L. (lxvi, 487 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. m. 12.80.

Meyer (Kuno). Contributions to Irish lexicography. Vol. I, part I. (xxxi, 574 S.) gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*, 1906. m. 20.

Mystiker, deutsche, des 14. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Frz. Pfeiffer. gr. 8. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. 2. Bd. Eckhart, Meister. Hrsg. v. Frz. Pfeiffer. 2. unveränd. Aufl. Anastatischer Neudr. der Ausg. v. 1857. (xiv, 687 S.) 1906. m. 13.

Plini Secundi C., naturalis historiae libri XXXVII. Post Ludov. Jani obitum recognovit et scripturae discrepantia adiecta ed. Carol. Mayhoff. Vol. I. Libri I-VI. (xvi, 556 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. m. 8.60.

Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters hrsg. v. Ludw. Traube. I Bd. Lex. 8°. München, *C. H. Beck*. 2. Heft. Rand, E. K.: Johannes Scottus. I. Der Kommentar des Johannes Scottus zu den Opuscula Sacra des Boethius. II. Der Kommentar des Remigius v. Auxerre zu den Opuscula Sacra des Boethius. (xiv, 106 S.) 1906. m. 6.

Sjögren (H.) Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen. (vii, 243 S.) gr. 8. Uppsala, *Akadem. Buchh.*, 1906. m. 4.50.

Tirocinium Caesarianum. Begründet v. Berth. Otto. Fortgesetzt v. Herm. Hillner. Liber II et III. (ii, 87 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *K. G. Th. Scheffer*, 1906. m. 1.50.

ITALIAN.

Afevork (G. J.) Grammatica della lingua amarica. Roma, 8°, p. 332. 15.

Veniero (A.). I poeti de l'Antologia palatina. (Secolo III a. C.). Vol. I, parte I. Asclepiade - Callimaco - Dioscoride - Leonida Tarentino - Posidippo. Catania, 8°, p. cxii, 272. 5.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Angus (S.) The Sources of the first ten books of Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* (Princeton Ph. D. Thesis). Princeton, N. J., *Princeton Press*, 1906. \$1.
British School at Rome, Papers of the. Vol. III. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1906.

Bücheler (Franz). Gedächtnisrede auf Hermann Usener. Mit e. Bildnis Useners. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. 85 pf.

Caesar. Gallic War. Books I-V. Ed. by H. W. Johnston and F. W. Sanford. Boston, *Benj. H. Sanborn & Co.*, 1906.

Clarke (G. H.) and Murray (C. J.) A Grammar of the German Language. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1906. 6s.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Editum consilio et impensis Academiae Litterarum Caesareae Vindobonensis. Vol. XXXXVII. Q. Sept. Florent. Tertulliani Opera ex recens. Aemilii Krugmann. Pars III. Vindobonae, *F. Tempsky*. Lipsiae, *G. Freytag*.

Croiset (Maurice). Aristophane et les partis à Athènes. Paris, *Albert Fontemoing*, 1906. 3 fr. 50.

Curtius-v. Hartel. Griechische Schulgrammatik, bearb. v. Florian Weigel. 25. durchges. Aufl. Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1906. 3 Kr. 10 h.

Curtius-v. Hartel-Weigel. Griechische Schulgrammatik. Kurzgefaszte Ausg. Wien, *F. Tempsky*. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1906. 2 Kr.

Dionysius Bar Salibhi. Against the Jews. Part I. The Syriac Text. Ed. by J. De Zwaan. Leiden, *E. J. Brill*, 1906. \$1.

Dörpfeld (Wilhelm). Zweiter Brief über Leukas-Ithaka. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen von 1905. Athen, *Buchdruckerei Hestia*.

Easter (D. B.) A study of the Magic Elements in the Romans d'aventure and the Romans Bretons. Part I. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, *J. H. Fürst Co.*, 1906.

Eastman (Charles R.) The earliest predecessors of Copernicus. (Reprinted from the Popular Science Monthly, April, 1906.)

Egypt Exploration Fund. Archaeological Report, 1904-1905. Ed. by F. Ll. Griffith, London and Boston. Report of the nineteenth ordinary general meeting, 1904-1905. London, *Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.*

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by James A. H. Murray. MATTER-MESNALT (Vol. VII). By Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. Double Section. 5s. \$1.25.

Ferguson (W. S.) The Priests of Asklepios. A new method of dating Athenian Archons. University of California Publications. Classical Philology. April 14, 1906. Berkeley, *The University Press*. 50 cts.

Greenwood (James M.) *Successful Teaching. Fifteen Studies by Practical Teachers.* New York, *Funk & Wagnalls Co.* \$1.

Gruppe (O.) *Griechische Mythologie u. Religionsgeschichte. Zweite Hälfte. 3. Lieferung (Schluss des Werkes). Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* Herausg. v. I. v. Müller. Fünfter Bd. 2. Abth. 2. Heft. 3. Lfg. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1906. 15 m.

Hadzsits (G. D.) *Prolegomena to a study of the Ethical Ideal of Plutarch and of the Greeks of the first Century A. D.* U. of Michigan Thesis. Cincinnati, *University of Cincinnati Press*, 1906.

Hamilton (G. L.) *Ventaille.* Reprinted from *Modern Philology.* Vol. III. No. 4. April, 1906.

Heidel (W. A.) *Qualitative Change in Pre-Socratic Philosophy.* Sonderabdruck aus dem Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie. XIX. Bd. Heft 3. 1906.

Hermes. *Zeitschrift für classische Philologie.* Herausg. v. F. Leo u. C. Robert. XLI. 2. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1906.

Husik (Isaac). *Judah Messer Leon's Commentary on the Vetus Logica. A Study based on the MSS with a Glossary of Hebrew Logical and Philosophical Terms.* Leyden, *E. J. Brill*, 1906.

Jaques (L. C.) *Intermediate French Translation and Composition.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.* 45 cts.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXVI. Part I. 1906. London, *Macmillan & Co.*

Kennedy (C. W.) *The Legend of St. Juliana.* Translated from the Latin of the *Acta Sanctorum* and the Anglo-Saxon of Cynewulf. Princeton, *The University Library*, 1906.

Kleingünther (H.) *Quaestiones ad Astronomicos libros qui sub Manilii nomine feruntur pertinentes* (Diss. Jena). Leipzig, *Fock*, 1905. 1 m. 30 pf.

Krebs (J. Ph.) *Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache.* 7. genau durchges. u. vielf. umgestaltete Aufl. v. J. H. Schmalz (in 10 Lieferungen @ 2 Mark). 4. Lfg. Basel, *Benno Schwabe*, 1906.

Kroll (W.) *Das Studium der klassischen Philologie. Ratschläge für angehende Philologen.* Greifswald, 1905.

Kunze (Richard). *Die Germanen in der antiken Literatur. Eine Sammlung der wichtigsten Textstellen.* I. Teil. Römische Literatur. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, Wien, *F. Tempsky*, 1906. 1 m. 20 pf.

Lazare (Jules). *Premières Lectures. A New French Reader.* New ed. 35 cts.

— *Lectures faciles.* 35 cts. *Elementary French Composition.* 35 cts. *Contes et Nouvelles, First and Second Series @ 35 cts.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906.

Mahaffy (J. P.) *The Silver Age of the Greek World.* Chicago, *The University of Chicago Press*, 1906. \$3.

Manley (E.) and Allen (P. S.) *Four German Comedies.* Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906. 45 cts.

Mémoires de la Société Néo-Philologique à Helsingfors. IV. Helsingfors, *Wasseniuska*. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1906.

Modern Language Review. Vol. 1. No. 3. April, 1906. Cambridge, *At the University Press*.

Müller (F. Max.) Deutsche Liebe. Ed. with Introduction, Notes and a Vocabulary. By James Chapman Johnston. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1905. 45 cts.

Newbold (W. R.) Philolaus. Sonderabdruck aus dem Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie. XIX. Band. Heft 2. Berlin, *Georg Reimer*, 1905.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. Neunter Jahrg. XVII. u. XVIII. Bandes 3. 4. u. 5. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906.

Niedermann (Max). Précis de phonétique du latin. Avec un avant-propos par A. Meillet. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1906. 2 fr. 50.

Phillimore (I. S.) Index Verborum Propertianus. Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*, 1906. \$1.50.

Polyratiri Epicurei περί ἀλόγων καταφρονήσεως libellus. Ed. C. Wilke (Bibl. Teubneriana). Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. 1 m. 20 pf.

Pope (G. U.) A Handbook of the ordinary dialect of the Tamil Language. Part V. A Tamil Prose Reader, adapted to the Handbook. Seventh Edition. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1906. \$2.

Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τοῦ ἔτους 1902.

“ “ 1903.

Ἀθήνησιν, 1906.

Rand (E. K.) Johannes Scottus. Quellen u. Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters. Erster Band. Zweites Heft. München, *C. H. Beck*, 1906.

Russian Reader. Accented Texts. Grammatical and Explanatory Notes. Vocabulary. By Paul Boyer and N. Speranskin. Adapted for English-speaking Students by S. N. Harper. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1906. \$3, net.

Scholia in Lucianum ed. Hugo Rabe (Bibl. Teubneriana). Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1906. 6 m.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

Stati (P. Papini) Thebais et Achilleis. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit H. W. Garrod. Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*, 1906. 5s.

Skeat (W. W.) Pierce the Ploughman's Crede. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1906. 2s.

Smith (C. Alphonso). Studies in English Syntax. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906.

Three French Comedies. Notes, Vocabulary and Excursus by Roy Temple House. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906. 40 cts.

Tyler (H. M.) Selections from the Greek Lyric Poets, with a historical introduction and explanatory notes. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1906.

Venetianer (Ludwig). Ezeiels Vision u. die Salomonischen Wasserbecher. Budapest, *Friedrich Kilian, Nachfolger*, 1906.

Vest-Pocket Dictionary of the English Language by James C. Fernald. New York, *Funk & Wagnalls Co.*, 1906. 25 cts.

Warren (Minton). On five new MSS of the Commentary of Donatus to Terence. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XVII, 1906.